

THE AMERICAN ✠ CHURCH ✠ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

November, 1920

Vol. 8 No. 3

Editorial Comment	- - - -	179
The Lambeth Conference.—The Movie Mind.— Drains on the Ministry.—Following the Leader. —The Gospel and Protestantism.		
The Mind of Christ Concerning Marriage	-	189
<i>Walker Gwynne</i>		
Jesus Christ on Labor and Wages	- -	210
<i>Stanley Matthews Cleveland</i>		
Ecclesiastical Efficiency	-- - -	221
<i>One Who Has Caught the Vision</i>		
The Church and Social Problems, II	- -	230
<i>Clinton Rogers Woodruff</i>		
Healing Cults Within the Church	- -	241
<i>Herbert H. Gowen</i>		
Our Lesser Ladies of November	- -	256
<i>Minna Caroline Smith</i>		
Book Reviews	- - - -	265

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under act of March 3, 1873

Issued by the **TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO.**, 1 and 3 Peace Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager

OFFICES: 1 and 3 PEACE STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

A NEW QUARTERLY REVIEW
The Pilgrim
A Review of Christian Politics and Religion

Edited by the REV. CANON WILLIAM TEMPLE

To be Published quarterly. Vol. I. October 1920. Price per number 85 Cents.

Yearly Subscription (4 numbers,) \$3.20, payable in advance

The avowed aim of "The Pilgrim" is "to give expression to the growing body of conviction that in the historic Christian faith is to be found the one solution of the problems that beset the world." Regarding no department of thought as lying outside that faith, the review will deal with all the questions of the day, both sacred and secular, one of its main purposes being "to undermine the distinction between those spheres as commonly understood."

THE GREAT CHURCH AWAKES. Ideas and Studies Concerning Unity and Reunion.

By EDWIN JAMES PALMER, D.D., Seventh Bishop of Bombay. \$2.00 net

Bishop Palmer's aim has been not only to offer some important prolegomena for the Lambeth Conference, but also to put before all bodies of Christians the inner reality of the Reunion movement. Chapters are included on "The Ministry in the Primitive Church," "What is a Bishop for?" "The 'Validity' of Sacraments," and "The Recognition of Ministries."

MISSIONARY SURVEY AS AN AID TO INTELLIGENT CO-OPERATION IN FOREIGN MISSIONS

By ROLAND ALLEN, M.A., sometime S.P.G., Missionary in North China, and THOMAS COCHRANE, M.B., C.M. \$2.40 net

HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY AND THE APOSTLES' CREED

By the Rev. J. K. MOZLEY, Principal, Leeds Clergy School. \$2.00 net

This volume aims at an exposition of leading ideas in the Apostles' Creed, and, at the same time, at emphasizing the historical character of the Christian religion, and the interdependence of facts and faith. The writer is of the opinion that in the primitive facts is contained a supernatural Gospel, from which may be derived a thorough-going Christian world-view, and that to this the Creed bears witness. Thus the Creed needs not re-statement, but an exposition which does justice to its character and value.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION: The Bampton Lectures, 1920.

By the Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, M.A., D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. \$4.00 net

"No other recent book on the Church and its ministry matches this volume in importance. It brings out the essential elements of the problems with which it deals clearly and dispassionately. . . . [the] book is to be commended to the patient study of all, to whatever Christian body they belong, who desire to restore the unity of Christendom."—*The Times* (London).

THE EUCHARIST IN INDIA. A Plea for a Distinctive Liturgy for the Indian Church

By J. C. WINSLOW, J. E. G. FESTING, D. R. ATHAVALE, and E. C. RATCLIFF. With a Preface by the Bishop of Bombay. \$3.00 net

Extract from the Bishop's Preface: "This little book is both revolutionary and important. I commend it to the careful attention of all who are interested in missionary policy. In particular I commend it to my fellow-Bishops who are soon to meet in the Lambeth Conference. It has the merit of presenting a crucial question in a concrete form."

DEATH AND BEYOND. A Study of Hebrew and Christian Conceptions of the Life to Come.

By the Rev. C. T. WOOD, M.A., Dean and Lecturer of Queen's College, Cambridge. \$1.75 net

This book is an attempt to restate Christian conceptions of death and judgment, heaven and hell, in the light of modern views of the Bible and of the re-discovery of Jewish Apocalyptic literature. The author seeks to show that the dominant teaching of the Church on these subjects has been largely Jewish rather than Christian. The war has made us rebel instinctively against much of it; and the author believes that there is an imperative need to present to the educated layman the evidence about Christ's real teaching on the "last things," and to state a coherent view of His complete conquest of death and sin.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers, New York

THE desire to own good books indicates mental calibre above the ordinary for there is plenty of mere reading to be had for a small price. Oxford books make a special appeal to those who cherish their own library.

A selection of those recently issued.

HELLENISTIC SCULPTURE

By GUY DICKINS

Net \$8.00

A scholarly monograph, beautifully illustrated, for the art lover and student.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN EUROPEAN THOUGHT

Edited by F. S. MARVIN

Net \$6.25

Twelve essays by noted scholars summarizing the work of the leading European thinkers in the last fifty years.

BELGIUM

By H. VANDER LINDEN

Net \$3.75

An authoritative and fascinating account by the Professor of History at the University of Liege.

SAFEGUARDS OF LIBERTY

By W. B. SWANEY

Net \$2.25

A masterly discussion of the three great charters on which our liberty is founded.

MODERN PUNCTUATION

By GEORGE SUMMEY, JR.

\$1.50

A practical treatment of its utilities and conventions.

ENGLISH MADRIGAL VERSE 1588-1632

By E. H. FELLOWES

Net \$6.25

A selection from the original song books of a large and important body of English verse which has not hitherto been collected.

THE LISTENER'S GUIDE TO MUSIC

By PERCY A. SCHOLES

Net \$2.00

A book for every one interested in music explaining how to listen to and understand any form of instrumental music without technical knowledge.

SPACE AND TIME IN CONTEMPORARY PHYSICS

By MORITZ SCHLICK

Net \$2.50

An adequate, yet clear account of Einstein's epoch-making theories of relativity.

SPANISH PROSE AND POETRY

By IDA FARNELL

Net \$5.25

A splendid collection of translations with a critical appreciation of each author.

RES METRICA

By W. R. HARDIE

\$3.40

An introduction to the study of Greek and Roman versification of great value to every student of poetic metre.

At all booksellers or from the publishers.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS American Branch
35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



OXFORD BOOKS

"The standard of textual excellence."

CONTRIBUTORS FOR NOVEMBER

The Rev. Walker Gwynne, D.D., is the Rector Emeritus of Calvary Church, Summit, N. J., and is the author of several books on the church and the Prayer Book.

The Rev. Stanley Matthews Cleveland is Assistant Rector of Trinity Church, Princeton, N. J.

Clinton Rogers Woodruff is a well-known attorney and churchman of Philadelphia, who has written much on social and municipal subjects.

The Rev. Herbert Gowen, D.D., is Professor of Oriental Language and Literature, University of Washington, and priest in charge of St. Mark's Church, Seattle.

Minna Caroline Smith is a New York churchwoman, who often writes for the magazines.

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

42 Albany St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: GUY VAN AMRINGE, 55 Liberty Street, New York

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year

Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Twenty-five Cents a Copy

Foreign subscription, \$2.50 a Year

Volume VIII

NOVEMBER, 1920

Number 3

The Lambeth Conference

WHEN two hundred and fifty bishops of the Catholic church enter into conference and compose resolutions dealing with questions of critical importance to religion, these resolutions are deserving of the utmost respect and consideration. Whether we agree with them or not, they are not to be lightly accepted or rejected. In themselves these utterances have no authority, just as in themselves the decrees of a general council have no authority. It is only their acceptance and promulgation by the various provinces of the church that gives them any authoritative sanction.

The pronouncements of Lambeth have no binding force in the United States unless or until they are accepted and imposed upon the various dioceses by our general convention. Nevertheless they are carefully considered statements on controverted moral and religious questions, set forth by our fathers in God after earnest prayer and serious deliberation. They ought therefore to be studied prayerfully and patiently by all serious-minded people in the church during the coming months.

For this reason we do not feel ready or qualified to make extended editorial comment upon them at present. Our first feeling upon reading them was one of enthusiastic commendation and of gratitude to almighty God. This enthusiasm was to be sure somewhat chilled by the apparent intention of the bishops to admit women to holy orders. An order of deaconesses is one thing, a female diaconate is quite another, and utterly opposed to the whole Spirit-guided tradition of the church. So serious a departure from the usage of all other parts of the Catholic church would be an insuperable obstacle to reunion and must necessarily fall to the ground. It is well to bear in mind that this proposal received the support of only 117 out of 250 bishops.

As regards the proposals for reunion, we do not see how they could be better, except for an unfortunate phrase here and there. We were particularly pleased to read the bishops' insistence upon the kind of ministry that would be acceptable to all parts of the church. Without that of course there can be no unity. And yet we doubt if very much will come of their proposals. The irreducible minimum which the bishops have laid down appears to be too stiff a dose for nonconformist leaders, such as Dr. Carnegie Simpson for example, to swallow. At any rate we do not think there is

any good reason why Catholics in our communion should accuse the bishops of undermining our position. What has satisfied the Bishop of Zanzibar and the Bishop of Nassau ought to satisfy the rest of us.

We hope to publish from time to time during the year articles by competent theologians and specialists on the separate portions of the Lambeth report. In the meantime we hope that our readers will purchase the volume containing the reports of all the committees and the resolutions in full, and fully inform themselves as to what the bishops have actually said.

The Movie Mind

THE movies are unquestionably the most popular form of recreation. Vast numbers of people, grown-ups as well as children, patronize them whenever they have the money and the time and the opportunity. Many visit them daily. This being the case, it would seem futile to inveigh against them as a deleterious moral influence. One might as well bemoan the moral effects of moonlight. The only question we need to ask is, what, as a matter of fact is to be their effect on the morals and manners and mental processes of the coming generation. Having ascertained that, we may make the attempt to adjust our educational methods and disciplinary practices to fit the conditions.

We hope in the near future to publish one or more carefully considered articles on the moral influence of the movies. At present we are thinking chiefly of their effects on the minds of their devotees. We entertain the suspicion that they conduce to shallowness of thought and insensibility to appeals addressed to the reason. The intellect becomes habituated to receiving impressions which follow one

another in such rapid succession that they never get beneath the surface. The mind becomes a sort of looking glass. There is no opportunity, and soon there is no desire, to think about what one has seen and relate it to one's daily living. Tragic and comic scenes, melodrama, current events, preposterous absurdities, beautiful views of the natural world, succeed one another in a heterogeneous jumble; and one emerges from gazing at them nervously exhausted, if one has not succumbed to the strain and gone to sleep.

All this, constantly repeated, produces a type of human being which we must reckon with in church work and life, as well as in social and political endeavor. It is the sort of person who simply looks on and does nothing. Speak to people of this sort about some necessary task to be undertaken, or some pathetic case of human suffering and need, and they will simply look at you with open mouth, waiting for the next remark. It does not occur to them that anything is to be done about it. Their emotions have long since ceased to have any direct connection with their wills or their intellects. They are like old draft-horses that have been beaten so often that they can no longer feel the sting of the whip. Obviously such people are not an asset in the life of the church,—unless to help form an audience for movies in the parish house!

All this applies equally of course to the speaking drama. To see a play every night would soon paralyze all mental activity and destroy the power of the will. To be deeply moved without putting the emotion aroused to good use is always harmful psychologically. But no one does see a play every night. It is the cheapness of the movies that has made the movie mind a factor to be reckoned with.

Drains on the Ministry

AT a time when there has been a lamentable falling off in the number of young men who are seeking holy orders, there appears to be considerable shrinking in the active parochial ministry from other causes. These causes are chiefly three: the transfer of allegiance to other religious groups, the relinquishing of the ministry altogether, and the taking up of secretarial work.

The first of these causes is continuously operative. There are always temperamentally restless souls in every ministerial group, who find it irksome to spend their whole lives in the same ecclesiastical setting. It is pleasanter and easier to shift the setting. This is one of the unavoidable penalties of a divided Christendom.

The second cause, the relinquishing of the ministry for secular work, is especially aggravated by the arduous living conditions of the present day. The value of money has so depreciated, that the clergy simply cannot subsist on the old minimum salaries. It seems unbelievable that the laity of the church should permit good men to resign from the ministry on such grounds. There are no doubt others who are resigning because for one reason or another they can no longer sincerely preach the dogmatic and moral message of the church. Unless they have the will to repent and amend their ways, they certainly should resign. The following advice of Mr. Arthur Bertram in his stirring book, "In Darkest Christendom" (Allen and Unwin), ought to cause deep searchings of heart in many a priest:

Our solemn advice to men in the ministry whose hearts are not aflame with the compassions of Christ, is that they should quit the business altogether. You only add to your condemnation, and give God a bad name, by staying where you are, for so long as you are in

the ministry you are taking His Name in vain. You have mistaken your role altogether; you are not the men who should minister the gospel, but the men who should listen to its message. That message is addressed to you, with its warning of judgment, its call to repentance, and its promise of pardon. It was for you Christ died, but until you know His love and forgiveness you cannot minister Him to others. Until you are saved you cannot save the people.

As for the clergy who have withdrawn from the parochial ministry to take up secretarial positions in the diocesan and general administrative work of the church, we do not presume to judge them. To their own Master they stand or fall. But we do, in our innocence, wonder why these administrative tasks cannot be done quite as well by laymen. Or has not the church been able to develop laymen sufficiently interested in religion to undertake these tasks?

Following the Leader

HUMAN beings must have some one to worship, or something,—and so they worship the best they can find. Not having found God, or Jesus Christ, or the Holy Spirit, many people are worshiping some human leader: a prophet, a lecturer, a novelist, a statesman, a politician, a social worker, a philosopher, a clergyman, a college professor, or a doctor.

Who does not know many members of the church whose lives centre entirely about their rector, their confessor, or some distinguished preacher? Obviously they have not found Jesus, or they would not put their trust in a purely human saviour. The clergy should be merely path-finders, or guides, or rescuers, whose function it is to lead people to Him Who is their only true life. They should never come between the soul and God. They should rather be doors that open into the divine presence.

It is sad to see so many people in the church exalting the ministers of Christ to this false position. How many go to church primarily to please the clergy, and only when their favorite priest is preaching or conducting the worship! They take up some form of church work, not because in it they have an opportunity to serve Christ, but in order to please their dear rector. They will give money for some worthy cause providing *he* asks for it. They lose their so-called religion, if he does not call on them. They are unhappy for weeks if he rebukes them, or fails to greet them with a smile!

This game of following the leader often has pathetic consequences. He perhaps falls from grace, and his followers see their idol shattered before their eyes. Possibly some of them find another leader, and he in turn disappoints them. Then they wander about disconsolate and forlorn, with no respect for religion and the church. They believe in nothing. They are soured, disheartened, disillusioned, and they easily become supporters of some shallow ephemeral cult, if not of the latest brand of anarchy.

In how many instances, we wonder, are the clergy responsible for encouraging these poor, silly souls to put their rector in the place of God?

Protestantism and the Gospel

THE essential thing for the Christian is to be in loving, vital relationship with Jesus Christ. Our ecclesiastical connections are of secondary importance. For souls have found Christ and lived in daily contact with Him, under the most opposite ecclesiastical influences, whether Catholic or Protestant. We would not go so far as to say that it makes

no difference what church we belong to, so long as we are in union with Jesus Christ. It does make a difference, because some churches are more helpful than others in bringing us into that mystical union with Him. The Catholic system of religion is of greater practical assistance to those who would see Jesus than the various Protestant systems. Nevertheless, in spite of such meagre and attenuated religious aids as they possess many Protestants have found Jesus and by His grace advanced far on the road to Christian perfection.

Protestants themselves perhaps would not be inclined to state the case in quite this way. They have often criticised the Catholic church on the ground that its elaborate symbolism carries the faithful too far away from the simplicity of the gospel. They would therefore hold that the Protestant systems of religion are better calculated to bring one to Christ than the Catholic system. It is interesting to see this Protestant position questioned by an English nonconformist minister, the Reverend W. G. Peck. Mr. Peck is one of the leaders of the Free Catholic movement, which is a sort of Oxford movement among English dissenters. In his latest book, "From Chaos to Catholicism" (Allen & Unwin), he has this to say in defence of the Catholic system (p. 209) :

It is sometimes objected concerning the more gorgeous symbolism of Catholic worship that this sort of thing seems to carry us far away from the gospel according to St. Mark. It does. It carries us to the Apocalypse of St. John. It is said that a priest wearing costly vestments does not seem to be celebrating the worship of the poor and lowly carpenter of Nazareth. But he does not pretend to be doing just that. He is celebrating the worship of One who stands in the midst of seven golden candlesticks, clothed with a garment

down to the foot and girt with a golden girdle; whose voice is like the sound of many waters, in whose right hand are seven stars; and on whose head are many crowns. We submit that the casual visitor to any ordinary Free Church would never suspect, from anything there to be seen, that our Lord had ever been either born or crucified or exalted, or that anything in particular had ever happened either to Him or to us.

It is of course the common assumption underlying much modern Protestant teaching and writing that the pure religion of the gospel was in the earliest centuries overlaid with Catholic superstitions and abuses, and that these encrustations were removed and the pure gospel rediscovered in all its pristine glory by the continental reformers of the sixteenth century, chiefly in Germany. How far this Teutonic product resembles the religion of the gospel we do not wish to say. The comparison suggests an interesting subject for an article. We wonder if there is not some truth in the following comparison of the gospel and Protestantism by Professor George Santayana. We quote from an interesting selection from his writings called "Little Essays" (p. 81), recently published by Scribners:

The gospel is unworldly, disenchanted, ascetic; it treats ecclesiastical establishments with tolerant contempt, conforming to them with indifference; it regards prosperity as a danger, earthly ties as a burden, Sabbaths as a superstition; it revels in miracles; it is democratic and antinomian; it loves contemplation, poverty and solitude; it meets sinners with sympathetic and heartfelt forgiveness, but Pharisees and Puritans with biting scorn. In a word, it is a product of the East, where all things are old and equal and a profound indifference to the business of earth breeds a silent dignity and high sadness in the spirit.

Protestantism is the exact opposite of all this. It is convinced of the importance of success and prosperity; it abominates what is disreputable; contemplation seems to it idleness, solitude selfishness,

and poverty a sort of dishonourable punishment. It is constrained and punctilious in righteousness, it regards a married and industrious life as typically godly, and there is a sacredness to it, as of a vacant Sabbath, in the unoccupied higher places which such an existence leaves for the soul. It is sentimental, its ritual is meagre and unctuous, it expects no miracles, it thinks optimism akin to piety, and regards profitable enterprise and practical ambition as a sort of moral vocation. Its Evangelicalism lacks the notes, so prominent in the gospel, of disillusion, humility, and speculative detachment. Its benevolence is optimistic and aims at raising men to a conventional well-being; it thus misses the inner appeal of Christian charity which, being merely remedial in physical matters, begins by renunciation and looks to spiritual freedom and peace.

The Mind of Christ Concerning Marriage¹

REV. WALKER GWYNNE, D.D.,

General Secretary of The Association for the Sanctity of Marriage.

1. *The Greatness of the Problem.*

THERE is no more momentous social, religious, or political question facing the people of America today than that of marriage and divorce. History tells us in unmistakable language that when the family is destroyed the destruction of the nation follows inevitably. In the year 1916, according to the latest official report, there were no less than 112,036 divorces in the United States, and the increase every five years is 30 per cent.

For Christian people, who are the bondservants of Christ, and therefore His true freemen, there can be only one supreme law of marriage as of all else in life, namely, the mind and will of their divine Master. That is an axiom that needs no argument. The one question, then, which this paper has to deal with is, What is the mind of Christ concerning marriage? If that can be conclusively answered, then for us who believe in Him as God Incarnate, the cause is forever settled. No matter what those who are not Christians may think, or civil legislatures and law courts may do, or the man in the street may say, for us there

¹The first of a series of papers to be issued by the Association for the Sanctity of Marriage, under the editorship of the Publication Committee, consisting of the Right Rev. the Bishops of Vermont, Pennsylvania, and Colorado, the Rev. F. B. Reazor, D.D., Rector of St. Mark's Church, West Orange, N. J., and the Rev. Walker Gwynne, D.D., Rector Emeritus of Calvary Church, Summit, N. J.

is but one line of duty. Christ has spoken. The case is ended.

And the search for the mind of Christ concerning marriage is neither obscure nor difficult. It is not a question to be made only by deeply learned theologians. Everyone that runneth may read. In the New Testament our Lord has expressed His mind so plainly that there can be no mistaking His words.

More than once our Lord proclaimed His will uncompromisingly in the face of hostile Jews whose rulers had reduced the primal law of marriage to the level of mere concubinage. The effort of Moses in dealing with the question is the first of which we have any record in history, but it was rather in the way of restriction of inevitable evils, "because of the hardness of their hearts," than of a return to first principles. Moses dealt with divorce as he did with slavery and polygamy, as an accommodation to men's weakness. But scribes and Pharisees, like their modern representatives, the divorce lawyers, found or made plenty of additional loopholes whereby, fifteen hundred years later, they obtained for their clients divorces "for every cause" (St. Matt. xix. 3).

It was then in view of this condition that we find our Lord restating the law of God "as it was from the beginning of the creation." That this teaching was absolute and unqualified by any exception, *and spoken in the face of bitter enemies, whose hostility might have been softened by even one exception*, is the testimony of three witnesses.

2. *The Witness of St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul.*

In St. Mark, the earliest of all the Evangelists, we have this record: "There came unto Him Pharisees, and asked

Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting Him. And He answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said 'Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and put her away. But Jesus said unto them, For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of the creation male and female made He them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and the twain shall become one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. And in the house the disciples asked Him again of this matter. And He saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her; and if she herself shall put away her husband, and marry another, she committeth adultery." (St. Mark x. 2-12, Rev. Version here and in all other quotations.)

St. Luke's testimony is exactly to the same effect. Here again He is addressing Pharisees, and we have the same stern unqualified statement, "Everyone that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another committeth adultery, and he that marrieth her that is put away from a husband committeth adultery" (St. Luke xvi. 13).

And when we turn to the teaching of those disciples whom Christ sent forth to proclaim His Gospel in the whole world, and to establish His Church, we find no shrinking from this lofty and severe doctrine concerning marriage. It was not now with the low practices of their fellow countrymen they had to deal. They were face to face with, if possible, the lower practice of the great pagan world of Greeks and Romans.

St. Paul was not one of the original Apostles who heard Christ's teaching from His own lips on earth. His knowl-

edge of the Gospel was not received from others who were Christians before him, but directly "through revelation of Jesus Christ," as he himself tells us (Gal. i. 11, 12; Eph. iii. 3; 1 Cor. xi. 23). And so it happens, when the Apostle has to deal with this fundamental question of marriage we find him proclaiming the same high doctrine that other disciples had heard from His lips on earth.

To his converts in Corinth he writes: "Unto the married I give charge, yea not I [alone, though guided by the Holy Spirit], but the Lord [Jesus Himself], That the wife depart not from her husband (but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife . . . And so ordain I in all the Churches" (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11, 17).

To the Christians in Rome he writes: "The woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth. . . So then if, while the husband liveth she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress" (Rom. vii. 2, 3).

To the members of the Church in Ephesus he writes (Eph. v. 22 to end), glorifying the relationship of husbands to their wives, as his Lord had done, by comparing it with that spiritual union of Christ with His Bride, the Church, than which nothing can be closer or more holy: "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church and gave Himself up for it; that He might sanctify it. . . Even so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies. . . even as Christ also [loves] the Church, because we are members of His body." Then he repeats Christ's republication of the primal law, "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh."

And now he cannot restrain his wonder at the marvelous thought of it all; "This mystery is great!" he writes, "but I speak in regard of Christ and of the Church." For great indeed is the mystery, whether it be the marriage of a man to his wife, or that which is its prototype and pattern, the marriage of the Eternal Son who left His Father in heaven that He might win us sinful men to be His Bride, and present us to Himself "a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing."

Surely here, in all these witnesses, St. Mark, St. Matthew and St. Paul, we have beyond question a perfectly consistent declaration as to the true mind of Christ concerning marriage. It is impossible to misunderstand this teaching. The marriage bond is no mere contract, dependent for its continuance on the faithfulness or the wish of either husband or wife. Whatever marriage may be among heathen peoples or unbelievers, merely a form of concubinage, among Christians there can be no doubt as to what Christ ordained it to be: one body, as He and His Church are one body, and one vine; one flesh, as He and His Bride are one. For though the Bride prove unfaithful a hundred times, the bond with the Bridegroom is not severed. It is only dishonored. (See St. Matt. ix. 15; St. Mark ii. 19; Rev. xxi. 2, 9; xxii.17.)

3. *The Supposed Exception in St. Matthew.*

But here it will be asked, "Did not our Lord on two occasions make an exception to this stern rule which we have found in St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul? Did He not allow the remarriage of the innocent party when the other party had been guilty of adultery?" This is one of those strange and perverse misinterpretations which come

partly from careless and uncritical reading, and oftentimes from self-interest.

At the outset it is very suggestive that these two statements attributed to our Lord are found only in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. In the fifth chapter the passage reads: "It was said also, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement; but I say unto you, that every one that putteth away his wife, *saving for the cause of fornication*, maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery" (verses 31, 32).

The second passage in St. Matthew (xix.1-12) describes the same event as that which we have already considered in St. Mark's Gospel (x.1-12), and in each we have the same strong words as to God's law "from the beginning"; that "the twain shall become one flesh"; and "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Here also as in the fifth chapter of St. Matthew, Christ's words read, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, *except for fornication*, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery" (ver. 9). Thus St. Matthew differs only from St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul in this single exception. And the important question is. "What does the exception mean?"

4. *The Exception is Fornication and not Adultery.*

Inasmuch as our Lord uses both "fornication" and adultery" side by side, in both these passages, as He does also elsewhere (St. Matt. xv.19; St. Mark vii.21), it is plain that the two words do not have exactly the same meaning. This distinction however cannot be pressed, because the

words are sometimes used interchangeably as signifying the same thing, as seems to be the case here. Nor is it at all necessary to insist that fornication may be only the sin of an unmarried man or woman, and not adultery. For even granting that the exceptive clauses really mean "except for adultery," let us see what inference can be drawn from this as regards the alleged right of remarriage.

According to the strict Jewish law, the punishment of adultery both for man and woman was death by stoning (Lev. xx.10; Deut. xxii.22). In which case, if the law were carried out, the innocent party would be free, not because adultery had sundered the bond of marriage, but because death had done so. The utmost, therefore, that could be inferred from these exceptive clauses, granting that they are genuine, would be that the death of the adulteress was sufficient ground for the remarriage of the innocent party, whether man or woman. But if this is what our Lord meant, it would be a mere platitude. Nothing therefore can be inferred from these two passages to prove that adultery breaks the bond of marriage, and leaves the innocent party, or either party, free to enter into another marriage.

But still granting that what is meant by the exception is adultery, there is even a higher aspect of the question concerning which our Lord has left us in no manner of doubt. Though that Draconic law of ancient Israel which called for the death of an adulteress was still on the Jewish statute book, Christ made it plain on one occasion that it formed no part of the law of His Kingdom. That also had gone with all the other concessions to the hardness of men's hearts. When a woman taken in the very act was brought into His presence by some who thought to trap Him in an inconsistency, He had only condemnation for her hypocriti-

cal accusers, and only a word of pardon for the sinner on her repentance. In fact His command, "Go and sin no more," surely implied, "Go and seek thy husband's pardon, as thou has obtained Mine. If he possesses My spirit, he dare not refuse thee" (St. John viii.3). And that doubtless is still the law of His kingdom, even for adulterers and adulteresses. It is as applicable to the sinful husband or wife as to any other sinner, in accordance with the great reply to Peter's question, "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him? until seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times, but until seventy times seven" (St. Matt. xviii.21,22).

5. *Only Putting Away Allowed by Christ, and not Remarriage.*

Or again, if we refuse to accept this interpretation of the exception, let us ask once more if His words can possibly mean what the hasty or interested reader infers as to the lawfulness of remarriage for the innocent party.

(1) In dealing with this question it is constantly overlooked that while the chief thought in the minds of Christ's tempters is concerning "putting away" or divorce, the thought uppermost in His mind, and on His lips, is the unlawfulness of remarriage. It is this, and not divorce, which He emphasizes again and again.

(2) It may even be admitted that the Mosaic permission to put away (in Deut. xxiv. 2) included permission to remarry, but so far is our Lord from expressing His approval of remarriage that He sweeps it away by His complete silence. *What was demanded by the occasion was a definite statement of approval of remarriage, but none is forthcoming.* On the contrary, referring to the very

passage which allowed putting away, He answers, "Moses for your hardness of heart suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it hath not been so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery" (St. Matt. xix. 8, 9).

(3) It is this interpretation of His language, moreover, that is alone consistent with what He said in His Sermon on the Mount concerning other perversions of God's eternal law. "I came not to destroy the law," He exclaimed, "but to fulfil. . . . Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill. . . . Ye have heard that it was said, Ye shall not commit adultery. . . . Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. . . . Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you." And then in every instance He condemns these self-interested perversions of sinful men, and He lifts up the ancient law of God to the high estate where it had been at the beginning. There can be no more accommodations to the hardness of men's hearts. "Except your righteousness," He says, "shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (St. Matt. v. 17, ff). The permissions of Moses, as well as the perversions of the scribes, are for ever cancelled.

(4) That this thought of separation, and not of permission to remarry, is what Christ has here in mind has further confirmation in the words of St. Paul, where he expressly claims that he possesses "the mind of Christ" and is speaking by His authority. Writing to the Church in Corinth, and clearly distinguishing between true mar-

riage between Christians and the union of a Christian with an "unbeliever," he writes concerning the former: "Unto the married I give the charge, yea not I, but the Lord [Jesus], That the wife depart not from her husband (but and if she depart let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband) ; and that the husband leave not his wife." Concerning the latter case he gives only his own best judgment: "But to the rest say I, not the Lord [Jesus], If any brother hath an unbelieving wife, and she is content to dwell with him, let him not leave her. And the woman which hath an unbelieving husband, and he is content to dwell with her, let her not leave her husband. . . . Yet if the unbelieving departeth, let him depart: the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such cases." In other words, the strict law of Christ concerning indissolubility applies only to the holy estate of marriage, "in the Lord," as between a Christian man and a Christian woman (1 Cor. vii, 10-17).

6. *Mr. Gladstone on the Exceptive Clause*

Writing in 1857 Mr. Gladstone, a layman, a scholar, and no mean theologian, uses this illustration to show the falsity of any interpretations that would read into the exceptive clause more than our Lord's express words signify.

"Suppose," he says, "we found this precept, 'Whosoever shall flog his son, except it be for disobedience, and put him to death, shall be punished by law.' What should we think of the interpreter who founded upon this sentence the position that a father might, for disobedience, flog his son to death? If the law-giver intended to give this Draconic permission, the rules of speech would inevitably lead him to a different arrangement of his words; and he would say, 'Ex-

cept it be for disobedience, whosoever shall flog his son and put him to death shall be punishable by law.' ”

. . . “But now let us look at the case on the other side. If the exceptive words give a permission, as we contend, only for putting away and not for remarriage, everything becomes at once clear and simple; for then the words could only be put in one place of the sentence, and that the one in which we actually find them.” That is, after “shall put away his wife,” and *not* after “shall marry her when she is put away.”

Once more, quoting the authority of Bishop Middleton (“who has studied the use of the Greek article in the Hellenistic Greek of the New Testament under the lights of modern criticism”), Mr. Gladstone calls attention to the important fact that the absence of the article from the word *apolelumenen*, “her who is divorced,” in St. Matthew, as well as in St. Mark and St. Luke, takes away all ambiguity from the meaning. It can only mean one thing, not “the” divorced woman but “a” divorced woman, that is, “any” divorced woman: “The words of all three, therefore,” writes Mr. Gladstone, “condemn remarriage of the divorced woman, and condemn it *universally*, in terms which grammatically admit of no other construction” (*London Quarterly Review*, on the English Divorce Act of 1857).

To the same effect Bishop Gore writes, “So serious an exception [as allowing remarriage] must have been *expressed*,” that is, not merely implied or left to inference, but in definite words whose meaning could not be mistaken (*The Question of Divorce*, p. 23), or to put it differently, if our Lord had intended to allow remarriage of either innocent or guilty party, He would have said so plainly and not in a parenthesis, or what is known in law as an *obiter dictum*.

7. *Even Adultery Cannot Break the Bond, but only Profane It.*

Once more, it is strangely assumed, but without any authority whatever, that adultery is the one sin that breaks the bond of marriage, and that a judgment of divorce merely records something which already exists. But the simple fact remains that neither this nor any other sin however grievous, is anywhere named by our Lord, or by any one of His Apostolic writers, as possessed of such power of destruction. In His eyes adultery is indeed a great offence before God and man, but judged by His actions as well as by His words it is by no means the greatest. Hypocrisy, falsehood, theft, covetousness are sins that call out His deeper woe and condemnation. So far in fact, is our Lord from asserting or even implying that the bond of marriage is broken by adultery, *He actually assumes the very opposite.* For in every one of the passages, He declares that a divorced woman commits adultery if she marries another and that "whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." *But it is only because the original bond continues* that another union *can* be adultery.

For let us think what takes place if the bond be really broken. It follows logically and necessarily that not one but *both* parties are free to marry, the guilty just as much as the innocent. If the bond is broken there is no other alternative. Why then does our Lord forbid remarriage as He does, to the guilty, while, as some contend, He allows it by His silence to the innocent? The only possible explanation of this seeming but unreal inconsistency is that the inference from His silence is entirely wrong. The bond of marriage, the "one flesh" that "God hath joined together," is not broken. It is only profaned. Neither party

is free. Both must bear the consequences, as in many other relations in life, of their rash or unwise choice. They are still man and wife in God's eyes. *Christ has never said one word, or given one hint to the contrary.* Therefore the prohibition of remarriage necessarily applies to innocent and guilty alike.

Were it otherwise, our Lord would be placed in the position of not only countenancing but actually encouraging unfaithfulness. For in that case the surest and easiest way for both parties to obtain freedom to marry as they pleased would be to commit the sin of adultery. A perfectly logical conclusion, but one utterly inconceivable! That this also is the actual effect of such false interpretation of our Lord's will is well known to our judges. One prominent Justice of a supreme Court tells us that "evidence in divorce cases is the most unreliable known to the courts; while perjury, subornation of perjury, and collusion are constant." Moreover, the common purpose of the suit is a new and adulterous union, which has been already planned.

8. *Some Remarkable Corroborative Testimony*

On this feature of the case the words of a remarkable book by Professor Felix Adler of Columbia University, and founder of the Ethical Culture Society, are well worth quoting. Arguing from very different grounds, basing all on the principles of ethics, sociology, and physiology alone, the author reaches exactly the same conclusion as that held by the whole Primitive Church and the whole Western Church, concerning the mind of Christ. Starting with the axiom that marriage is not primarily a contract but "a natural tie," "one flesh," like that of father and son, he writes: "The tie between husband and wife is one that

differs from the parental and filial only in the fact that, while into the one we are born, into the other we can freely enter; but are as truly bound when we have entered. The decision is irrevocable . . . One can no more disown a spouse than he can disown a child" (*Marriage and Divorce*, D. Appleton & Co., 1915, p. 58).

"That is done in novels," he says, "but it is impossible, at least to a moral person, in real life . . . It may be said that in the one case the tie is a natural tie, a tie of consanguinity; and that in the other case the tie is not of so close a nature; but I maintain that the mutual surrender in marriage takes the place of the natural tie, otherwise it were unutterably, intolerably base. A tie as strong as nature has been formed, when once there has been this mutual surrender. The husband cannot cut the wife adrift, nor can the wife cut the husband adrift, no matter what faults appear, any more than the parent can cut the child adrift" (Ib. p. 49).

"True, it is very hard sometimes to bear the burden of this law," he adds. "I said at the beginning that if I were a praying parson, I should pray for sympathy not to become unfeeling to the complex, secret agony herein involved. But the law is inexorable. The father must bear his trouble, if the burden of a prodigal son is laid upon him. And the wife and husband together must bear their trouble, if trouble be laid upon them" (Ib. p. 50).

"This is my position," Dr. Adler says elsewhere: "Separation, but not divorce. But it may be asked, What is the difference between separation and divorce? . . . The difference is that in the case of separation there is no permission to remarry," he replies (Ib. p. 44). And that is only putting in other words Mr. Gladstone's statement of the dif-

ference: "While divorce of any kind impairs the integrity of the family, divorce with remarriage destroys it root and branch."

In adopting this distinction, moreover, Dr. Adler, though recognizing no divine authority in our Lord, as Christians do, does not hesitate to quote with complete approval "the famous words of Jesus" about forgiveness "till seventy times seven," as one other reason for refusing any right of remarriage. It was also this merciful thought of forgiveness in "the mind of Christ" that was in the mind of St. Paul, when he laid down the rule that if a wife is obliged to separate from her husband, she should "remain unmarried, *or be reconciled to her husband*" (1 Cor. vii. 11). And the practical reason is evident. A new marriage would close the door effectually against reconciliation. If remarriage were allowable to either party, innocent or guilty, that door would be forever shut.

That this was the judgment also of the early Church is further evident from the book of Hermas called *The Shepherd*, dating from about A.D. 75, and of such weight in sub-Apostolic times that it was read in the service of the Church as Holy Scripture. Its author declares concerning the penitent who is put away by her husband, "If the husband do not take her back, he sins, and brings a great sin upon himself; for he ought to take back the sinner who has repented . . . But if he put away his wife and marry another he also commits adultery" (Book II. commandment iv. chap. 1).

9. *The Exceptive Clauses Inconsistent, Contradictory, and Probably Unauthentic*

What has been said hitherto has been based on the assumption that the exceptive clauses in the first Gospel are

authentic parts of the book as St. Matthew preached or wrote it. But there are exceedingly strong grounds for rejecting this assumption altogether.

(1) The first of these is their inconsistency with the positive and unqualified statements of St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, and even with their own context. Concerning this so conservative a writer as Bishop Gore, formerly of Oxford, says: "The critical conclusion that the exceptive clause in the first Gospel is an interpolation, which really alters the sense of our Lord's original utterance about marriage . . . represents an impressive consensus of scholars from Germany, France, America, and our own country—a consensus, moreover, who, as being mostly Protestants in conviction, were predisposed in favor of the laxer view of the marriage bond" (*The Question of Divorce*, p. 23).

This argument from the inconsistency of the exceptive clause even with its own context is well stated by Professor Tyson: "If Christ really uttered these words ('Save for fornication')," he writes, "so far from elevating the conception of marriage, He has not raised it one whit higher than the level of Moses, whereas the very purpose of His previous words is to contrast His teaching with that of Moses! . . . 'Moses for the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives . . . but I say unto you, etc.' Did He then go on simply to reaffirm that Mosaic enactment that if he found in his wife 'a shameful thing' he could divorce her? Clearly the whole context of St. Matthew itself is an absolute witness against it, as the exception itself is inconsistent with the solemn prohibition of verse 6, 'What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder'" (*The Indissolubility of Marriage*, Stuart L. Ty-

son, M.A., Oxon., pp. 35,36). Moreover the height and severity of Christ's judgment here are clearly reflected in the wondering exclamation of the disciples when they reach the privacy of "the house." "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry." In fact it is only on the assumption of this unqualified severity that their exclamation, and Christ's answer, "All men cannot receive this saying," are at all intelligible (St. Matt. xix. 10, and cf. St. Mark x. 10).

(2) A still stronger reason for regarding the exceptive clauses as unauthentic and probably an interpolation of some Jewish-Christian scribe or editor, is found in the very nature and purpose of St. Matthew's Gospel, intended as it was for the use of the Church wherever Jewish Christians predominated.

It is to be remembered that probably all, or most, of St. Paul's epistles contain the earliest record of our Lord's life and teaching, his first Epistle to the Corinthians, written about A.D. 55, being some ten years earlier than the earliest of the Gospels. They were the letters, moreover, of "the Apostle to the Gentiles," addressed primarily to converts from heathenism in the great centres of the Roman Empire, Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, etc. This purpose is true also of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Luke.

On the other hand St. Matthew's Gospel was written primarily for Jewish Christians, as every page, as well as universal tradition, testifies. It was circulated chiefly in Palestine where prejudice long persisted in favor of traditional Jewish customs. If then this earliest Gospel as preached by St. Paul, St. Mark, and St. Luke to Gentiles, contained no mention of an exception in favor of remarriage, while that Gospel for Jews did, there must have been something

seriously lacking in the Gentile version of Christ's teaching. In that case the Gentiles had not received "the whole counsel of God." Yet St. Paul solemnly asserted to the Ephesian clergy that he had "not shunned to declare the whole" to them when he was present, and later when he was a prisoner at Rome, he even wrote to them about this very matter of marriage, declaring it to be indissoluble, and an essential part of that "counsel of God." It is "a great mystery," he says, like that perfect and indissoluble union that exists between "Christ and the Church" (Acts xx. 27; Eph. v. 25 to end).

"But if this be so," these Gentile Christians might justly ask, "why should this exception to the law of marriage be made known only to Jewish Christians, and be kept hidden from us?" Could it possibly be true that Gentiles were under a sterner law than Christ imposed on their Hebrew brethren? Are Jewish converts to be granted the privilege (if privilege it be) of seeking a new union, in case the first proved to be a failure, while Gentile converts could claim no such right? Such a thing is inconceivable. Taken in conjunction with what has been already said about other inconsistencies, it affords the strongest *prima facie* evidence that the exceptive clauses (especially if understood as allowing remarriage) form no part of St. Matthew's record of our Lord's teaching.

10. *The Mind of the Church*

There is still one other strong, it may be said, even conclusive reason for the accuracy of the preceding argument as to the mind of Christ concerning marriage. It is found in the fact that in the whole Church of the first three centuries, when our Lord's will was fully known and fresh in the memory, the indissoluble character of marriage, "in

the Lord" (1 Cor. vii. 39), that is, between two Christians, was fully recognized in principle and acted on in her discipline. "It is most significant," writes Mr. Watkins in his elaborate and scholarly treatise on *Holy Matrimony*, "that the testimony of the first three centuries affords no single instance of a writer who approves remarriage after divorce in any case during the lifetime of the separated partner, while there are repeated and most decided assertions of the principle that such marriages are unlawful . . . No writer of the first three centuries is found to advocate or admit the remarriage of the innocent husband . . . If the voice of the earliest Church is to be heard, Christian marriage is altogether indissoluble" (*Holy Matrimony*, by the Rev. Oscar D. Watkins, M.A., Macmillan, 1895, pp. 222, 225). Thus, to quote the words of Bishop Gore, "Criticism and authority converge upon one result" (*Marriage and Divorce*, p. 26).

The later history of marriage, and the causes for the lowering of the standard of marriage in the Oriental Church after the fifth century, and among Protestants in the sixteenth, must be treated in a separate paper. It will suffice here to say that the whole Western Church, including the Roman Communion and the Anglican, have always steadfastly held to the indissolubility of the marriage bond.

This is still the highest law of the Episcopal Church in America, so long as the office for the solemnization of Matrimony in her Prayer Book remains as it is. The proviso of Canon No. 42 allowing the remarriage of "the innocent party in a divorce for adultery" did not exist in the American Church until introduced as a "resolution" in the General Convention of 1808. And this Convention, which thus attempted to reverse the law and practice of the whole

Primitive Church and of the whole Western Church ever since, consisted of only two Bishops, fourteen clerical, and thirteen lay deputies!

11. *Summary of the Foregoing Argument*

(1) That the exception in St. Matthew is not only solitary in the New Testament, and in remarkable contrast with the general, or rather the universal, manner of our Lord's teaching, but is directly contrary to the positive and united witness of St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, and is also inconsistent with its own context.

(2) That the grammatical construction in St. Matthew v. 32 and xix. 9 shows conclusively that the passage at most only gives permission for "putting away" and not for remarriage, which is not once mentioned except to condemn it. On the other hand, remarriage for the innocent party requires more than silence.

(3) That remarriage is in direct contradiction to our Lord's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount, where He sweeps away all concessions to the hardness of men's hearts, and elevates God's law above "the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees." *Any* allowance of remarriage naturally would, and actually does, lower it to that level.

(4) That if it were true that the exception was only meant for converts from Judaism, appearing as it does only in the Jewish Gospel of St. Matthew, then the Gentile Christians, who heard nothing of it from St. Mark, St. Luke and St. Paul, would have had serious ground of complaint for being denied a right granted to Jewish converts. But no such complaint is found in Scripture or later history.

(5) That it is neither asserted nor implied anywhere in the New Testament that adultery, or any other sin,

breaks the bond of marriage, any more than it breaks the bond between father and son. On the contrary, the assertion that marriage with a divorced person is adultery implies necessarily that the bond is not broken, and that the man and woman are still husband and wife.

(6) That remarriage of either party closes the door to reconciliation irrevocably, and is directly contrary to Christ's words concerning forgiveness "till seventy times seven."

(7) That these reasons, together with the fact that the judgment and discipline of the whole Church in the first three centuries forbade remarriage, form cumulative and conclusive evidence concerning the mind of Christ on the subject. They are accepted also by a consensus of some of the most eminent critical scholars of today as proof that the exceptive clauses in St. Matthew are the interpolation of some Jewish scribe, and are not the words of our Lord.

12. *Applies Only to Marriage Between Christians.*

In conclusion, it is to be remembered that what has been here written has only to do with marriage between Christians. As in the early Church, so now, there are still cases to which these principles cannot be applied, as in heathen lands, where polygamy exists, and marriage is merely concubinage, and not "Holy Matrimony." How these cases were dealt with by St. Paul is seen in 1 Cor. vii. 12-17. Such cases, however, do not involve any departure from the law of Christ, but only the oftentimes difficult application of that law to special or peculiar circumstances.

It may be only idealism to attempt the elimination from all civil legislation of any allowance for divorce from the bond, *a vinculo*. That is the condition which has always existed and still happily exists in South Carolina, where

only legal separation, *a mensa et thoro*, is allowable. It may even be difficult, or next to impossible, to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, allowing the enactment of a uniform Federal law on marriage and divorce. Nevertheless it always remains the supreme duty of professing Christians to be content with no lower standard than that of Christ. That is always practicable, as it was in early days, for those who use the grace and power which He alone can give. "Ye are the light of the world. Ye are the salt of the earth," Christ says. Here is our responsibility, for here also is our strength.

Jesus Christ on Labor and Wages

REV. STANLEY MATTHEWS CLEVELAND

THE kingdom of heaven is Jesus' name for perfect human society here on earth. It is the end of a process, the end of a long development. By an age-long process starting with Christ, which is a combination of slow advance, periodic catastrophe and sudden spurts of leaping forward, culminating in "the coming of the Son of Man" in glory, the Holy Spirit is steadily evolving mankind into a social system which will be perfect. The kingdom of heaven is that final state of human society here on earth, "wherein God and the spirit world and man, man and man, man and nature shall have attained to their perfected reciprocal relationships." It is "that far-off divine event towards which the whole creation moves." It is the consummation of all human striving. And it is coming here on earth. We, by our efforts may retard its coming; we may hasten its com-

ing, but we cannot stop its coming. All humanity is in the grip of infinite Love, a force as irresistible as the rush of life, which clothes the world in green at the rebirth of every spring. Let us grasp that idea first and thoroughly. The kingdom of heaven is not the ideal of some impractical dreamer, it is that stage and state of society towards which we are developing irresistibly under the impetus of the almighty push of the love of God. The process of that development, its stages, whether we move slowly or rapidly towards that great end,—these alone are in our hands. The end is certain.

Most of Jesus' teaching about the coming kingdom of heaven, is a description of conditions, an outline of laws, which shall prevail in that kingdom. Also he brings out strongly the contrast between the kingdom which he was building and the society of His own day, as, for example, in the prefaces to sections of His great sermon on the mount: "Ye have heard that it is said by them of old time . . . but I say unto you." Also he makes it perfectly clear that the coming of the kingdom is a process as, for example, in the parable of the leaven (Matt. 13:33): "Another parable spake he unto them; the kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." And the parable of the mustard seed (Matt. 13:31-32): "Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof."

But most of the time Christ's vision, like the vision of all

great seers, leaps over the intervening ages, and dwells, in picture form, upon the outline of the perfect consummation of society in the kingdom of heaven as it is to be. "For a thousand years in thy sight, are but as yesterday, seeing it is passed as a watch in the night."

Not two thousand years have past since Jesus, seeing with the eyes of God, drew for us the outlines of the kingdom, which, under the impulsion of the Holy Spirit was to be built on earth. So today we are in the midst of the process. Indeed the process has gone only a little way. This fact should not appal us. The church is very young yet. As a human institution it is a baby, hardly out of its long dresses. What are two thousand years compared to the millions of years, with which we measure the previous phases of God's evolution of creation!

Our own duty, coming face to face with our Lord's picture of the coming kingdom of heaven, is to realize that He is drawing for us a picture to the *end* and *object* of the process of which we are a part, in which we are a stage. Our duty is, first, to note the contrast between our Lord's picture of what perfect human society is to be like and our own society; the contrast between the kingdom of heaven and present-day civilization. Our duty is, secondly, to realize that on us as baptized children of God, as soldiers of Christ, as the legitimate inheritors of the kingdom of God on earth, as members of the church which is His army and His body,—that on us lies the responsibility of remoulding, of remaking the institutions of our society into something more like the picture which Jesus drew. Our duty, thirdly, is to realize that in this effort to remould our civilization into the likeness of the kingdom of God, we must use Christ's methods, and not the methods of human sin. It is

perfectly true that, in theory, some of our modern revolutionaries have got hold of some of the principles of the kingdom of God. It is equally and bitterly true that they are trying to bring in a perfect human society by methods which are the direct opposite to the methods of God, and which are sure to defeat their own ends. The method of God is the irresistible attraction of universal love. The method of Lenin is the bloody coercion of universal revolution. The method of God is for nations and industries and men, by loving their neighbors more than themselves, to arrive at the universal brotherhood, which shall bring in the kingdom of God. The method of Lenin and the third international is class war and class hate, dictatorship of the proletariat, which is just as bad, just as anti-Christian, just as much an obstacle to the advance toward the kingdom of God as autocracy and czarism in Europe, or class-conscious plutocracy in America.

Probably the most acute of our modern problems is the labor problem. The problem of the proper place, the proper reward and the proper function of labor, of its relation to production, is at the basis of our industrial problem and our industrial problem is at the bottom of all the other questions of human adjustment which have come so menacingly out of the Great War. The labor problem antedates the war. It is as old as human civilization. But it has come to the fore most acutely now, because our whole dealing with the subject is in a transitional stage.

Historically the labor problem was originally the problem of slavery. On the collapse of the Roman Empire the labor problem became, under feudalism, the problem of vassalage. Simple vassalage passed, with the rise of the cities

and the great middle class of Europe, into the more complex organization of the guilds of the later middle ages. With the rise of machinery and the modern industrial system the problem of labor became the problem of wages and exploitation. The first result of machinery in its large-scale modern development was to produce a new kind of slavery,—wage slavery. Capital accumulated in the hands of the operators of our great factories and human labor came naturally to be regarded as a commodity, which could be bought and sold without any regard to the human value involved. Money became the great standard of measurement. We measured everything in money. To get as much labor for as little money as possible was the principle of our industrial development. To get as much labor as possible for as little money as possible is still the principle of large sections of our industry.

And so capitalism of the past three generations has brought down on its own head the crisis of today. As money was their whole standard of value, to get as much for as little money as possible, it is not strange that the labor element merely accepted the standards of the industrial leaders, the magnates, the captains of industry. They were taught from earliest childhood to value everything in money; consequently, it is not strange that they have come in the present day to the logical position of trying to get as much money as possible for as little labor as possible. The same principle which capitalism applied to labor, labor is now applying to capital. The result of course is underproduction, and a strong feeling of antagonism, between the holders of capital and the producers of capital, between the executive and the workers,—a most unfortunate and unnatural antagonism, which has produced the high cost of

living in our own country, and the absolute destruction of production in Russia.

Everybody, from one point of view or another, is aware that the present state of affairs is unbearable. There are innumerable suggestions for the improvement of the situation ranging all the way from the benevolent paternalism of the National Cash Register Company, the high minimum wage of Henry Ford, profit sharing, proportional wage bonus, putting representatives of labor on board of directors as, for example, the Ivory Soap Company has recently done, to absolute cooperative production as in the case of a chain of restaurants in San Francisco, where all the stock is held by employees, and the head of the company holds only five per cent of the capital stock of the company.

On the side of labor we have, again, a whole series of suggestions for relief, "proposed roads to freedom" as Bertrand Russell calls them, ranging all the way from trade unions to the I. W. W., from state socialism to the farmer-labor party, from anarchism to syndicalism, from revolutionary communion to the modern bolshevik dictatorship, and, last of all, the most promising suggestion of all comes from England in that modern application of the medieval guild system which goes by the rather deceptive title of guild-socialism.

Our Lord deals very pointedly with the labor problem, the system and standards of labor as they will be in the fully developed kingdom of heaven,—in S. Matthew 20: 1-17.

For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that was a householder, which went out early in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard. And when he

had agreed with the labourers for a denarius a day, he sent them into his vineyard. And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing in the market-place, idle; and to them he said, Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right I will give you. And they went their way. Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour and did likewise. And about the eleventh hour he went out and found others standing; and he said unto them: Why stand ye here all the day idle? They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard. And when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the labourers, and pay them their hire, beginning from the last unto the first. And when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a denarius. And when the first came, they supposed that they would receive more; and they likewise received every man a denarius. And when they received it, they murmured against the householder, saying, These last have spent but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden of the day and the scorching heat. But he answered and said to one of them, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a denarius? Take up that which is thine and go thy way; it is my will to give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? or is thine eye evil, because I am good?

Note in the parable:

1. That the kingdom of heaven is likened unto the man who pays the laborers. The kingdom of heaven is perfect

human society. The suggestion here is that society itself will do the paying under perfect conditions, not that wages will be paid by individuals or individual corporations, but by organized society itself. There is here no suggestion of the form of organized society. Certainly this slight suggestion is not enough to base a theory upon—a theory of government-ownership or state socialism or guilds—but, I ask you to note the suggestion in order that we may check it up with other utterances of Christ's and actions of His apostles.

2. That all the laborers receive the same wage; some had worked 12 hours, some only one; yet all received a denarius. A denarius was the normal day's wage of the time of Christ. Note, too, that the 12-hour laborer who ventured to protest the injustice of this, is severely called to account. "Is thine eye evil, because I am good?" The first conclusion is, obviously, that the wage is not given in proportion to the labor, that amount of labor is not the standard by which wages are adjudged. This is the chief point in the parable. It seems unjust to us, who have for so many generations regarded wages as *payment* for the commodity we call labor. But from Christ's point of view, this is not unjust. His standard is service, not money. According to his standard the worker who had "borne the burden and heat of the day" was to be congratulated, for that he had had 12-hours opportunity for service, productive service, while his comrade had had only one-hour's opportunity for service.

Does this shift of standard from money to service seem ridiculous to you? That it is not ridiculous, but is the highest standard, is of easy proof. It is the standard of labor in all the higher professions. Who expects a minister to be paid proportionally to his labor? Who expects a doctor to

work better for a rich patient than for a "charity" patient? Who expects the teacher to whom we entrust our children to give no more than the labor represented by the average \$900 a year he receives? In the higher professions we have already grasped the principle of Christ's gospel of labor, that opportunity of service is the reward of labor, not the money which may incidentally be paid to the laborer.

Modern capitalistic exploitation is responsible for the fact that this principle of service rather than wages has not also become the principle of the mass of manual labor. In the days of hand labor, in the times of the medieval guilds, "craftsmanship" was the reward of labor, perfection of production was the principle which animated the masons and ironworkers who built the great cathedrals. What is that but the principle of service?

How easily the change is brought about is demonstrated to a slight degree in Russia. No Christian can fail to condemn the excesses and horror and atrocity of the bolshevik revolution. Nothing could be further from the kingdom of God than the tyranny of Lenin. But—one thing has happened there which deserves our notice. Money has lost its value! The workers of Russia are no longer working for wages. The workers of Russia are not working for service either. They are very far from the principle of Jesus. Their wages are not money; their wages are not service; their wages are power. Power is as dangerous to the kingdom of God as is money, when used as a standard of labor. But what we need to note is how quickly the standard changed,—it changed to something fully as bad if not worse,—but it *changed*.

Not by revolution, but by evolution it can change with us, and service can be made the standard of labor in America

as it is the standard of labor in the parable of the laborers in the vineyard.

If service is the standard of labor-payment in Christ's parable, why did the householder pay any wages at all? Here we have an important clue. They all received one denarius, the regular day's wage, not according to the amount of labor but according to the living needs of the worker. They were paid not according to the work they did, but according to what they needed to live.

That is how we pay our clergy, not according to their service, but according to what they need to live. That is the right way—I know one who refused a \$10,000 a year salary in business to take \$2500 in his parish. That, we feel, is admirable. We have nothing but righteous contempt for the priest who gives up his ministry in order to make money. That is a right feeling.

The same is true of teachers, who are paid a living-salary, but certainly not a salary based on their service. They should not be paid according to their labor, they should be paid according to their need.

That is the way all labor should be paid, the way all labor will be paid, in the kingdom of God. The modern labor unions with their principle of the same wages for the best and poorest labor have a *right* principle but they have a *wrong* motive. Instead of equality of wages releasing them for greater service, it is merely an excuse for laziness, leading even to sabotage. The fault is not, however, as superficial minds would like to see it, in the principle of equality of wages. It is in the system of exploitation and competition which is the curse of modern industry. The cure is not the

“open shop” and the class-war and hate it engenders, but in cooperative industry for production, not for profit.

It is a huge and complex subject, one which we cannot attempt to cover in one short essay. Not the least difficult question which Christ has left us to solve is: “who shall judge what is the living-need, on the basis of which equal wages shall be paid all mankind?” The modern corporations have not shown much aptitude for judging human values. Would the state show more? Would industrial guilds show more? I do not know.

But this I know. Christ’s principle for labor is clear, concise, distinct and direct, as brought out by His parable of the laborers in the vineyard: “From each according to his ability; to each according to his need.”*

By this principle we Christians can judge particular industries. That which tends to make service the reward of labor, to make wages in proportion to standard of living, not according to work done,—that is a step towards the economic perfection of the kingdom of God.

“From each according to his ability; to each according to his need.”

It cuts across many of the presuppositions of economics of the last few centuries—

But it is the principle of Jesus.

And Jesus is the Way, the way out of our modern chaos of selfishness, into the glorious liberty of the children of God, in that kingdom which shall be built, for which we pray: “Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth.”

*Hunter: “Why we Fail as Christians.”

Ecclesiastical Efficiency

A Letter from a Parish Priest, Who is Catching the Vision

MY DEAR HENRY:

YOU ask me how things are going in the old diocese and especially what the outlook is in the parish which is still so dear to you and your wife. Well, we are still pegging away at old St. John's, and I am holding on, first because the people are very dear to me and when the pinch came I couldn't bear to give up my pastoral care of them, and, secondly, because it seemed my *duty* to remain, despite the honor conferred on me by the council election, of which you had heard when you wrote. They really did honor me, I think, when they asked me to give up parish work to become missionary secretary. It would be a great thing to get into the wider field and have the vision of larger things. Everybody is enthusiastic, and now that I have decided to stay here I feel a little blue sometimes at the narrowness of parochial life; but I have tried to decide the matter conscientiously.

Things have been "booming" in the diocese. It is small, you know, but we have thoroughly caught the spirit of the new methods and are rather proud of our organization. As I said, everybody is full of enthusiasm and we expect great things.

Of course we have a diocesan council. There are twenty members, ten of them clergy and eight laymen, besides the two bishops. We began by electing an executive secretary, who is to have an office down town. He has a generous salary and a good allowance for office and other expenses. We were fortunate in getting the Rev. Dr. Brown to take

the place, although it meant, of course, his giving up the work at St. Paul's. We give him a good salary to compensate for that sacrifice, and he is to have young Peters (the Rev. Sam, you remember) as his assistant and field secretary. Both of them are to have secretaries, and there are two stenographers and an extra clerk at the office. The latter is the son of your old rector, who gives up his work in the east side chapel to go to the new office. He is to have charge of the files, to superintend the publicity end, to keep a card catalogue of all matters covered by the survey and to push literature in all the parishes and missions. We are to have a great deal of publicity work, both general and through the departments.

Then the council has organized on up-to-date lines. The head of the Social Service Department is Father Patterson, who, as you know, has had a great opportunity to study industrial and social questions at St. Agatha's. He gives up the work there in order to carry the social message to the whole diocese. You know he is identified thoroughly with the Socialist Party. It was felt to be a fine thing to have him, because he can represent the radicals in the movement toward a freer democracy in the church. Moreover, we hope he will be able to get the *entrée* into most of the socialist organizations. He will spend a good deal of time speaking in the industrial centers and so showing the church's thorough sympathy with the ends for which they are working. One of the finest things about the whole plan is that the Rev. James Brown has agreed to become his associate in the work. Splendid, isn't it, when you consider that they are diametrically opposed to each other in churchmanship? Their social convictions are almost the same, however (though they split over pacificism during the war), and

we look for magnificent teamwork. The council feel that what we need most is thorough education on social lines, and so young Smith, rector of St. Ambrose, is also to be engaged. You know he used to be a newspaper man, before he studied for orders, and he will get out some "corking" pamphlets, I expect. We are not behind in business methods here, either, and the office staff will be well organized. They will need but one stenographer, as Smith is a shorthand writer himself, but they are to have a secretary, and there is also talk of Jim Strong (you remember him as rector of St. Matthew's, Four Corners) being made secretary for rural work, with the idea of planning social service in the country missions on lines that will not offend the denominational brethren, and establishing community centers in the villages and smaller towns. He will be called our community expert.

The Department of Religious Education is going to tackle the rural work, too, and your old friend Black has left the rectorship of St. James', Brockton, to take over this end of things. He and Miss Scudder (who resigns her work as deaconess) are to give a whole year to the planning of courses for Sunday schools and the organizing of schools in some of the smaller missions where there are none now. A lot of the places have no children among the few members of the congregation left, but, of course, there are other children unattached, who ought to be won, if Black can get teachers for the schools and induce the parents to try out our system. Really it will be a sort of experimental station we have in mind for these places. Everybody in the council is quite set up about the idea. Black's people are terribly broken up about his leaving them, and from what you know of Strong's devotior to his flock you can imagine how heart-

broken they are; but we want both parishes to understand that they are releasing their clergy for the larger work of leadership of the whole church.

We have a general secretary for religious work, the Rev. Dr. Edwards, formerly of St. Mark's. He and Black will work together on the plans for introducing the Christian Nurture series in all parishes and on a monthly paper with special aids for teachers. There will be teacher training classes, diocesan conferences, etc., and so we have engaged Dr. Edwards' niece at a fairly good salary to superintend this work. Black's wife is to be with him in the office, in charge of the files and as general office secretary. They want someone to be always on hand, in case of calls by telephone or in person. There will also be a stenographer, as the plans already outlined will call for a great deal of correspondence. The church work will really be run on modern lines, you see, after the methods of big business.

Of course they are "scrapping" the junior auxiliary to form the new Church School Service League, which will coördinate all the young people's organizations in a wonderful way. We don't understand the plan just yet, but a good many conferences have been held about it, and with so many experts in New York working out the details it is bound to succeed. Edwards considers this the heart of the whole matter. He has been a little impatient because so many women think it will take away special initiative and incentive. When we really understand what the experts are planning, he looks for great things.

I shall not go much into the details of the rest of the organization save to say that the Rev. Wm. Jones (who has come into the diocese since you left) will head the publicity department, working with the central office. It is an

advantage that he has been a newspaper reporter. He will have a thoroughly equipped staff. One of the country clergy, Father Jackson, of Vincentown, will assist him, because he has been a great chap for advertising and he knows the country newspaper "game" (I think that is the word) from a to z. It ought to make a great hit with the laity who complain that the church has never put enough "pep" into its work. American people will not be satisfied much longer with old-fashioned methods; we have got to get ginger into the work of the kingdom as well as into every day business, as Jackson puts it.

The effort from which we hope for the largest results is the Parochial Missions Society. We have not decided yet whether this shall be a permanent department or shall work in conjunction with the Department of Religious Education. There are to be two chief missionaries, Father Worth and Dr. Tongue. Owing to the fact that the diocese has so many shades of churchmanship, we felt that both the Catholics and the Evangelicals should be represented in planning for the missions. (By the way, do you know anyone I could recommend for Worth's parish, now that his special work has led him to resign?) If we can rush through our plans during the next two months we ought to put across missions in every congregation of the diocese without any trouble. It can all be planned by correspondence.

I ought to say that Archdeacon Fuller is rather Broad and so that school will also be represented in the preaching missions, but though Fuller is in the work he will hold on to his office as Archdeacon, merely having an extra expense allowance and a secretary for this special thing. It will leave some of the missions without the usual celebrations of Holy Communion, but that cannot be helped.

Walter Everitt, rector of St. John's, Blackport, is now the secretary of the diocese. The new organization contemplates the co-ordination of a great many activities, to function through the secretary's office, and so he has resigned his parish and we have made the salary enough to more than cover what he received as rector, plus his secretary's job. The assistant secretary, young Burt (only a deacon now, but soon to be ordered priest) will give up work in his parish in order to help Everitt. You see, the combining of so many activities will make it necessary to have two men. Indeed, the various funds of the diocese are to be co-ordinated in the same way, under one treasurer. We are fortunate in getting President Miller, of the Sharpstown Bank, as general treasurer, but we felt that some of the clergy might resent enquiry letters and so on from a layman, and as he would need a clerk and office expenses anyway, the Rev. Wilson Duncan will take over that job, resigning the Dark River Parish. It is going to be hard to get some one to take his place, but Duncan is another of the men who feel that the call of the day is for real leadership, and, though he is young, the council felt that he was the man to give it here.

This leaves only the missionary department to be organized. It was this task that I was asked to take over. I really wanted to do it, as everybody felt that the work would be congenial; but you see there are only six parishes left now whose rectors have not been chosen for the central work, and I felt that I must hang on to the parish on that account. Three of the six remaining clergy are more than likely to be drafted by the general church for the work at headquarters. That would leave only three parishes with rectors (besides the smaller missions), and if they were

disorganized or the work slowed up through the resignation of the clergy I am afraid we might fall down on offerings to carry out the important plans already outlined. We are all wild over the plan and I wanted to be a leader too in the big work we have ahead of us, but some one has to hang on to the smaller task and I have reluctantly declined the election.

Besides, I was ordained for priestly and pastoral work, and somehow I cannot see my way clear to give it up for executive duty, even though the thing appeals so strongly. That may seem old-fashioned, and I am trying hard to be up-to-date, but, like Luther, "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise." Don't misunderstand me; I am heartily in favor of the new projects. The address of Dr. Allover fully convinced me. He really started us right by urging us to put the executive secretary in as a sort of department by himself (we call it Church Extension and Intensive Work). Only in my own case, as I said, I cannot bear to leave the distinctive work of the ministry and I hate to go away from the parishioners whom you and I both love. They make the priestly work a real joy. I hope you will think I was right in this decision. Dr. Allover was very convincing and sometimes I think I should have followed him all the way and given up parish work. And yet—well, I simply couldn't do it, there are such real rewards to every priest, and especially to one who has such people as mine. Then, of course, it wasn't merely a question of the satisfaction in the work—it seemed to me to be a question of *vocation*. What was all right, of course, for the others I couldn't excuse for myself; so a priest I remain, and I shall try to do my share in raising the money they will have to pay whomever they select in my stead.

Young Father Gordon thinks I was "dead right" in declining. He says that when he looks at the diocese now he feels like David as he gazed at Saul's armor; it was a beautiful bit of complicated machinery, but when he went out to slay giants he preferred his own little sling and stones. Gordon says that he hails me with delight as a nice old "back number," who with David and himself still trust in the Lord. But I don't like that sort of talk; it has been hard enough to make the decision and I don't want people to feel that I declined just because I am a "back number." You will see for yourself that indeed I am trying to catch the vision.

I hope your diocese is doing well. If a small one like ours can make such progress, you must have an organization really worth while.

Always yours,

BENJAMIN LEFTOVER.

P. S.—By the way, the larger work of the church is now making so many calls upon the Bishop and the Bishop Coadjutor that we feel we must do something at the next convention to give them aid. Young Henderson has resigned his parish to be the bishop's chaplain and secretary. I don't know whether we shall elect a Suffragan Bishop or not. It would seem to be the best thing, but we may decide instead to increase the number of Archdeacons to three. Either way will involve an expense, and sometimes I wonder where the money is coming from. We have used up all our N. W. C. funds in the diocesan organization; indeed, we haven't enough to pay for all we have planned, but are making a venture of faith. With so splendid an organization, we are bound to get more money next year, I suppose.

P. P. S.—You asked whether we had appropriated any of the N. W. C. funds for the mission chapel parish house which you had always hoped to see built on East Avenue. I am sorry to say we have not been able to pledge to *any* of the objects on the budget. The campaign only raised one-half the amount called for, and that isn't enough, as I said above, to meet the expenses of the diocesan organization, which everybody advises us is absolutely necessary if we are to get even as much money next year. I am a member of the diocesan council and it went hard to be obliged to turn down all these small parishes who were looking for help in some of their projects. But, as Allover said, they ought not to feel that the N. W. C. funds are a sort of Christmas tree, whose boughs are to be shaken every time they look for a gift. Besides, in using the money for the necessary machinery we are following the methods of the New York office.

We are crippled in the diocese by the loss of so many clergy for the larger work. Have you any names you can suggest to fill some of our vacancies?

B. L.

The Church and Social Problems

CLINTON ROGERS WOODRUFF

II

The Church's Attitude Toward Social Problems

THE present Dean of Worcester (the Very Reverend W. Moore Ede, D.D.) in his suggestive treatment of *The Clergy and Social Service*¹ discusses the threefold conception of the church: the individualistic, the corporate and the social. The first regards the church as a collection of individuals, a number of saved souls, where the appeal is made to this end, if not to the exclusion of the idea of the church as an organized society, at least to her subordination. "The church" he says, "is looked upon as consisting of a number of converted individuals; and individuals pass readily from one group to another because they regard one group as being as good as another and a man may please himself as to whom he associates with, and under which preacher he prefers to 'sit'; and in selecting the group to which he belongs, he is guided in the main by his personal predilections."

This is essentially the Protestant conception and it naturally affects the attitude toward social questions. Inasmuch as the number of Protestant bodies in this country is considerable and their constituents represent a large section of the Christian population of the country, it is important that their attitude toward social problems should receive attention, as it has in numerous books and pamphlets, and in a series of articles appearing earlier in the year in the pages of *The Living Church*. In his address at General

¹London: Edward Arnold, 1909; Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Company.

Convention last year, the Right Reverend Bishop of Connecticut (Dr. Brewster) on "The Solution of Social Problems," said:

The church ought to be holding high before this generation certain ideals. Her witness ought to be plain and pronounced against that valuation of material things, as constituting the chief good in life, which is at the root of the selfish luxury of those who have and the bitter envy of those who have not. The church's influence ought to be potent for the simplification and the spiritualizing of life.

It ought to be recognized that the industrial system is not an end in itself. It may be that it is industrialism rather than capitalism which is to be dreaded and counteracted. There is something more important than industry. There has been an exaltation of work and gain from work which means impoverishment and loss of soul.

Our report points out how this tendency may be traced to Protestantism², particularly of the Calvinist type. At any rate, it is time for a reaction and a return to something better, time to acknowledge that industry may be pushed and speeded up to the ignoring of the claims of human nature as proclaimed and sealed by the Son of Man. There must prevail the conviction that the wealth of a society is after all in the weal and worth and realized life of the men and women who compose it.

In that high conviction coming together, those who direct and those who labor, brain workers and hand workers, can yet, notwithstanding what is happening at Washington, I venture to hope, together work out solutions of grave problems confronting us. The captains of industry and the rank and file, marching under one banner, can make signal conquests for humanity.

Then the industrial system will take its proper place and perform its functions as an instrument of the kingdom of God on earth. It will do so as it illustrates the brotherhood and mutual service of that social gospel which is essentially involved in the church's Catholic charter and character.

The church, as "the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic

²The Report of the Joint Commission on Social Service.

Church" of the creed, is more than a collection of converted individuals "who meet together to have their faith sustained and strengthened by united prayer and praise, and stimulated by the words of a preacher. The church is a society with a corporate existence. The actions of Christ from the day in which He began His public ministry show that He intended His disciples to be bound together in a corporate society. The sacrament of baptism, which is a form of initiation into a society, and the sacrament of holy communion, by which men are brought into union with Christ and with one another, would lose no small part of their meaning if they had no reference to membership in a society."³

Herein we have a very different conception, a very different organization; an organism, in fact, rather than an organization, as Dean Vernon, of Portland, who is to be the new rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia, puts it. "The bride of Christ," designed by Him to do His work in this world, is a very different institution from the Protestant idea of a church. Again to quote Dean Vernon's distinction, one is a human institution working Godward; the other is a divine organism reaching manward.

When I speak of "the church" in these articles I will use it in the Catholic sense of the word, as taught in the creeds and in the Prayer Book, and in seeking to learn her attitude from her history, her Prayer Book and the Bible, we shall speak with reverence and with a due sense of the limitations under which one must of necessity work and write when seeking to learn her purpose and interpret her decrees.

The attitude of our blessed Lord to the social life of

³See *The Clergy and Social Service*.

His age may reasonably be accepted as the proper attitude of the church to the social life of each age. The first noticeable feature was His habit of treating all social and political problems which came before Him, primarily from an ethical and religious point of view. He showed no disposition to interfere with the existing and political order of His time, but established principles of moral and spiritual character applicable to every form of social and political organization. The only occasion on which He alluded to the dominant governmental administration of His day was when He contrasted it unfavorably with His own kingdom, the kingdom of God, in respect to the underlying motives of each.

Principles, however, are preached and established that they may be realized. Consequently it is the business of the church to proclaim the principles of Christ's gospel and to insist on their fulfillment in the various departments of human activity. Our Lord laid his chief emphasis, not on the value of any particular social polity, but on the value of the individual man. His rebuke of the Pharisees, and His willingness to call them "the children of the devil," was based on the ground that they had no sense of the worth of a human soul. Whatever then depreciates this worth, that is, saps the spiritual and moral utility of men, is hostile to the kingdom of God and must not only be opposed, but destroyed.

The church, then, is under solemn obligations to resist all interests destructive of the spiritual and moral worth of the individual man, woman or child, and she is within her legitimate sphere when she takes active measures to curtail or suppress such interests. Christ was a very practical Person, and His practical aim was the preservation

of spiritual utilities for the uses of His Father, both in this world and in the next.

In that striking report "The Church and Social Service" put forth by the English committee appointed by his Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury, we find the case stated in this way: "We believe that as Christ came to save, so the mission of this church is a mission of salvation, a salvation which includes both body and soul. We believe that as Christ came that men might have life, and might have it more abundantly, so the church should be the messenger and herald of life in the largest sense. Christ said, 'I am the Light of the world,' and He taught men to love God and their neighbor as He loved them. In the same way the church should be the bringer of life and light and love. She should not only heal those who are diseased, but fill with joy the ordinary labour and recreation and everyday business of men. In other words, Christian action, to be worthy of the name, must be social action, and social action of such a kind as shall in each age be best adapted to meet the needs of the age. Further, it must be not only the action of individual Christians, important as that is, but of Christian society as such. All church-workers and church people, if they are to carry out the teaching of the gospels, must support whatever tends to improve the welfare of the community. The community which is the church must serve and help that other community which is the nation. In such service churchmen and Roman Catholics and free churchmen can and should be united, so that the efforts of all who call themselves Christians may be directed to a single end. Indeed, through social work we may come nearer to a reunion of the Christian body."

As the Christian Social Union declared in one of the paragraph statements it published years ago: "If Christianity has really come from heaven, it must renew the whole life of man; it must govern the life of nations no less than that of individuals; it must control a Christian when acting in his business and political capacity as completely as when he is engaged in the duties which belong to him as a member of a family circle." If a religious principle is worth anything, it applies to a million of human beings as truly as to one; and the difficulty of insisting on its wider application does not furnish any proof that it ought not to be so applied. This is what the Christian Social Union intends by asserting that Christ must be exhibited as sole Lord of human life.

It must be borne in mind, however, as a member of the American House of Bishops has declared,⁴ the pulpit, which is one of the places from which the priests of the church instruct her members is "the place in which to deal with principles, not policies; motives, not methods. Its business is to arouse the conscience of men to actual sin and moral evil, and to inspire to righteousness. But its business is not to deal with economic, political or industrial methods and policies. As a citizen I have a perfect right to deal with such subjects and I do so without fear or favor. But when I am in the pulpit I have to deal with higher and deeper things than either methods or policies. If the pulpit is to fulfill its highest function and exert its greatest power, it must confine itself carefully to those questions of principle and motive about which there can be no dispute. It is not a question of being afraid to speak the truth; it is

⁴The Rt. Reverend the Bishop of Michigan.

simply a question of what kind of truth we ought to deal with.

"If any clergyman sets up a single-tax church or a socialistic church, he is certainly departing from his mission as a messenger and minister of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ, by confining Himself rigorously to the religion of principle and motive and appealing directly to the conscience, has given more impulse to industrial, economic, social and every other sort of reform than all the reformers put together that ever existed since His day. And His ministers must follow in His footsteps. As citizens, however, they have the right to exercise their judgment, and forward such policies and methods as recommend themselves to their judgment."

These are the words not of a reactionary, nor of one who believes in the principle of *laissez faire*, nor of one who seeks to evade a duty through advocating a policy of emphasizing general principles, but of one who is known as a radical in political and social circles, as one who is a determined opponent of wrong doing and as an intelligent sympathizer with forward movements.

In the words of another prominent churchman⁵: "For many years church people thought that the church had nothing to do with 'social problems.' They said that it was the mission of the church to preach the gospel and the gospel only, and that the pulpit was no place for politics. In these days sentiment has greatly changed, and from many pulpits our duties as citizens are expounded, and not infrequently we are advised that some political party or

⁵Lawson Purdy, a vestryman of Trinity parish, New York, and for years the secretary of the New York Tax Reform Association, and now secretary of the New York Society for Organizing Charity.

candidate for office stands for righteousness and that all good citizens should support the party or vote for the candidate.

"Somewhat more faintly we still hear the old injunction, 'The church should preach the gospel and the gospel only,' and under the plea there lies a truth, seldom clearly expressed and often entirely obscured. The difference of opinion is chiefly due to failure to distinguish the temporal from the eternal. Candidates for office, here today and gone tomorrow, details of administration, expediciencies of legislation—these are unmoral, transitory, temporal. The laws of God are eternal. It is man's duty to discover and obey them. To fail, brings punishment, swift and sure, upon us and upon our children, unto the third and fourth generation.

"The laws of God that govern the world of men are part of the gospel, part of the good news that this world is wide enough and rich enough for all mankind. If the church preaches this gospel there will be wrath in the hearts of some who sit in high places and heap to themselves riches they have not earned, and of those who have the wish without the power. But those who have a sense, however vague, of social wrong will flock to hear the message."

If the church is not to endorse specific plans of social regeneration, what then is her function? Fundamentally it is the cultivation of the right attitude toward social, political and civic questions. On the one hand charity and benevolence, on the other hand a rigid adherence to principle and duty, both religious and secular. In short the establishment of love and justice in all the relations of all men.

Perhaps one can best illustrate the personal phases of

these principles by a reference to the present Lord Bishop of London (the Rt. Rev. Arthur Foley Winnington Ingram, D.D.). He is a great Catholic bishop in the sense that he is a great Christian, a discriminating observer tells us. He is a great steward of the household of God. His heart is filled with the love of his fellow men, but most of all with love of the poor. Slumming has been to him no idle diversion. It has been his vocation, his life. Into it he has poured all the wealth of a boundless joy, of a nature all sunshine and generous emotion. Full of this primitive law of the faith, he has carried the cup of cold water to the lips of the dying in the garret, labored to drain the morass of the slum, lived his days and his nights among the forsaken and the hopeless. "He has little erudition, and less theology, perhaps; but he has the religion of service and sacrifice, and it is the only religion that counts."

"I ain't religious," said a 'bus driver, "and I can't stomach parsons. But there's something 'uman about 'im. I've heard him down east many a time, and I tell you when you've been a listening to 'im for a bit a kind of clean feeling comes over you, same as if it was your day off and you 'ad a bath and got your Sunday suit on."

The bishop, himself, narrates how he cultivated "the foot and door trick," in order to penetrate inhospitable homes. "After long hesitation," he says, "the door will be opened about half a foot by a little girl; you will hear a distant voice from the washtub in the rear, 'Well, Sally, who is it?' Then Sally will answer at the top of her voice, 'Please, mother, it's religion.' "

So far we have discussed the church's attitude in its broader aspects and attitude. These underlying principles, however, apply in general to the local parish. In the words

of *The Living Church* each local parish should be the hive from which workers swarm out to raise ideals about everything, and to accomplish the elevation of every institution in society. When the city hall recognizes that every church stands for all of that; when every force for evil in a city recognizes that every man in the church is in earnest in his intention to exhaust the whole sacramental energy of the Christian religion in its extermination; we shall no more be powerless in the presence of social and political evils. We shall exterminate them as a matter of course. The kingdom of this world could become the kingdom of our Lord and of His church today if every one of our churches was filled with men and women permeated with this ideal; if spiritual energy were being used upon society and not being exhausted upon our own puny little souls, that become over-saline because the salt is not mixed with the social mass that is as yet unsalted.

To paraphrase the *Pacific Churchman*, the prayer of the church, the communions of the church, should be directed toward the practical ends of human betterment. No one connected with a parish should be indifferent to human needs. They should be forced by their religious profession into the work of practical social service, which is a necessary preparation for the coming of the kingdom. The same thing is true not only of the parish but of the church in general in relation to organized reform. The church must not elaborate machinery for work, political or otherwise. There are machines enough already in existence. Charity organizations, hospitals, asylums, orphanages, homes, settlements, clubs, schools—every imaginable need is supplied. *The church must furnish the motive power for work, which is love.* We should be impelled to study first the needs of

the humanity about us; then the possibilities, both social and spiritual, of the many agencies created to meet those needs; and then we should co-operate sympathetically and intelligently with the appointed agencies. We must do all of this if we have the love of Christ in our hearts. To do less would be to fail in our duty to Him and those for whom He died.

In a still more concrete fashion, the Archbishop's committee declares that the church should not be content with merely mitigating social distress, but should recognize its responsibility for cultivating public opinion with a view to removing the causes of this distress; that the laity of the church, both men and women, should take an active part in the work of reconstruction and social service; that a greater diversity of forms of service should be recognized as church work; and that the term "church work" should be definitely regarded as including work upon public bodies; that the church people should, as part of their ministry, take a full share in movements and activities, both educational and industrial, which aim at raising the general level of social life; that church workers should receive adequate training for the particular form of social service upon which they wish to engage; that in the case of whole time church workers provision should be made for the payment of an adequate salary, and for the institution of a pension scheme.

Certainly these are very practical suggestions which must be borne in mind along with the further thought that the church should inspire us to do our work in the world. Through her we should find Christ and receive from Him fresh love and courage and strength and endurance. Our attitude should ever be with one hand uplifted to God and

with the other outstretched to man. We must draw strength for service from worship. We must know the love of God in order to love man. In His righteousness and truth and purity and peace alone can we find the inspiration and the sustaining grace we need. In the service of man alone can we find a place to express His love.

Healing Cults Within the Church

REV. HERBERT H. GOWEN, D.D.

FROM the day when Our Lord refused to allow the "Satanism of Time" to launch Him upon the inviting current of popular Messianic expectation it has always seemed the part of wisdom on the part of the Church to be exceedingly cautious in the presence of temptations of the "get-success-quick" order such as are suggested by the Time-spirit in every age.

This hesitancy need not involve the absolute condemnation of the things presented in the forefront of the temptation, considered by themselves. Christ, rejecting the suggestion that He turn the stones into bread, or that He become popular by some overmastering miracle, or that He become Lord of the world-kingdom through the generosity of Satan, did not thereby discredit His subsequent feeding of the multitudes, or the working of miracles which attracted the populace, or the command to His disciples to pray "Thy kingdom come." These things, in their proper place, were legitimate elements of the Messianic mission.

But, in fighting out the battle of alternatives on Quaran-tania, it was more important to keep in mind what was ultimate than what was incidental. So to plan for the satisfaction of the God-hunger of souls, to espouse consciously

the beatitude of rejection, and to face the task of winning the world by the slow travail of the Cross,—these things had to be placed beyond all possibility of obscurity. The matter was one of fundamental attitude and relation, a definite positing of values.

Now this temptation, met victoriously by Christ, to accommodate the preaching of the kingdom of what people are prepared to expect and accept,—that is, to conform Christianity to the age,—is perennial and insistent. It has its illustrations on every hand;—in the types and topics of sermons, in the fashions of parochial activity, yes, even in the kind of clergy who establish a vogue. One of the old Popes, suddenly applauded in the midst of a sermon, exclaimed: "Why, what have I said that was wrong?" Today, the Church, striking into some current of popular desire, seems readier to say, with some complacency, "At last we are on the right track!"

It seems to the writer that just at this point occurs the need for misgiving, and not least so when the Church seems officially stampeded into a course of action which has been for the most part unweighed and unconsidered.

Examples of such tendencies are not hard to collate. During the war it was found that patriotic addresses and talks by all kinds of speakers, qualified and unqualified, on everything from the needs of the Red Cross to the strategy of the Marne gave such a fillip to Church attendance that many congregations lost for weeks together the preaching of the Gospel. Then came the passion for "Drives," organized after the plans of the war world, and the rage for "Ten-minute men" who should galvanise a jaded Christendom into life by substituting the "efficient" point of view of the laity for the staleness of the responsible teacher.

With the Church thus yielding on every side to the temptation to subordinate functions to the glamour of materialistic appeal, it was not surprising that the desire would soon arise to deflect the mission of the Church into the channels of a healing cult, in order that the clergy who had apparently failed to win "success" by attracting people concerned about their souls might at least gain the attention of those who were concerned about their bodies.

Ere long, perhaps, the "beautiful idea" of establishing communion with the dead through the ouija-board, and the practical certainty that we may thereby fill our now depleted pews, will enable some up-to-date experimenter to win fresh success by an accommodation with modern spiritualism.

In dealing with this subject it is necessary to suggest several lines of thought which, however, can only be sketched in the barest outline, we must examine carefully the relative place occupied in the Christian religion by humanitarian activities. We must, more specifically consider the particular place which the healing of the body occupies in the ministry of Christ and in the extension of that ministry through the Church. We must furthermore point out certain dangers to which the Church exposes herself by adopting unreflectingly the principles of what may be conveniently termed "Hicksonism." And, lastly, we must seek to find the true balance of faith and practice for the application of the doctrine of the Incarnation to the complete redemption of man.

First, let us note that caution is suggested from the outset through the very popularity of the demand for healing cults, in whatever form and based upon whatever principle. The great Artemis of our modern Ephesians, whom all the

world worshippeth, is the goddess "Hygeia," generally recognized under the avatar of physical comfortableness. The English soldier who put down in the enlistment paper that by religion he was a Methuselahite, adding by way of explanation that this was "the religion of living as long as he could," was the apostle of an exceedingly popular creed. In many directions this creed has its devotees, even its bigots, who shirk all the conditions of life—Struggle, Labor, Pain—just as a dishonest school-boy shirks his construing with the aid of a crib. They think of Health as the paddocked ease of a comfortable cow rather than as the courage to work and suffer and strive in the light of the new Paradise ahead.

Undoubtedly the historic fact of the Incarnation did furnish a new and undreamed of impetus towards the physical amelioration of human conditions. All social reform, affecting the higher care of and reverence for the body, must inevitably spring out of the revelation of God in the flesh.

But it is clear this was incidental rather than a matter of primary significance. Coincident with the establishment of the truth that the body is the Temple of the Holy Spirit came the revelation that by the "body" we mean something more than this tabernacle of perishable flesh. As the vesture of an immortal spirit its significance lay beyond the physical and the temporal. So, even in the interest of the body itself, through the conviction that this gives place to a resurrection body suited to the strengthened and enlightened spirit, the emphasis was necessarily shifted from the temporal to the eternal. Men had to learn ultimately to "leave the flesh to the fate it is fit for; the spirit be thine." In consequence, there were hypothecated physical circumstances which, however much ameliorated by the exercise of Christian

charity, might safely be regarded as, in the long run, tolerable and even negligible, because of the new conviction as to man's immortal destiny. To refer once again to the story of Our Lord's Temptation, though Christ would indeed be the provider of bread and the fountain source of all philanthropy, yet He decided that His mission should never be disguised by putting that aspect as prominently forward as men desired. In many ways He would refuse to mitigate the harsh conditions of living. As Dr. Peyton writes: "In the refusal to be a corn-grower and the discoverer of a cereal of richer potency, Christ reveals the ground-plan of our being." The struggle for bread is always to go on. "By this economic law spiritual eminence will be obtained, nourished in the soil of want and carrying a moral chemistry from it, and the higher kingdoms will be found." The fact becomes increasingly plain on reflection and through the study of history that in a world from which the lower struggle has been eliminated the higher quest must be for the most part unrecognized.

Hence, while Christianity made the care of the human body a necessary by-product of the Incarnation, this had always to be envisaged practically as subordinate to the redemption of the whole man. Provided the higher aim were kept in view, the lower evils of poverty, sickness and death might easily be regarded as the merely temporal discipline of immortal beings. Christ did not exclude from His own experience the possibility of any of these things. We know He was poor; we know He died; we have no reason to believe that He was never sick.

The temporal and eternal aspects of the Saviour's ministry, we see, had to be kept adjusted and related according to a definite sense of values. But it is obvious that this re-

lation is all too easily disturbed. The disturbance is serious when religion takes an extreme form of "other-worldliness" in which the present and the physical are left beyond the scope of redemptive influence. The disturbance, however, is still more serious when the "health" (i. e. salvation) of the future state is ignored in the interest of a health which is merely that of a passing condition. The materializing of the spiritual in man must inevitably be the complete frustration of the purpose of the Incarnation itself.

It is the yielding to the temptation to "draw the circle premature, heedless of far gain," the desire to diminish the painfulness of the divine process, in order to ensure a comfortable ending short of the Almighty purpose. We had the case recently of men who sought to seize God's last gift of Peace, while shirking the task of securing by sacrifice the triumph of Righteousness. Temporal Peace seemed a splendid basis on which to erect the Temple of Justice. Similarly physical health has seemed to many a most desirable starting-point for the spiritual quest, though all history rejects this facile conclusion. Bad is the peace and Utopian the justice when the duty of sacrifice is ignored; deceptive is the assurance of health which seeks to escape the pains incident to spiritual growth.

With regard to the whole matter there is apt to be a startling transposition of goal. In the merely humanitarian program the goal is frankly materialistic; in the Christian program, which must necessarily recognize the diviner side of man, the goal must be understood throughout as spiritual.

There follows from all this the necessity of distinguishing between the healing of the body as a thing in itself and the healing of the body as included among the features of Our Lord's ministry.

The cure of bodily disease, while sanctified by the association with religion almost everywhere, is not necessarily a religious thing in itself. In all nations, at all times, the most varied methods have been employed, none altogether without some success and some scientific warrant. Healing by herbs, drugs, acupuncture, moxa-burning, surgery, will-power, faith in some formula, or faith in some person, prayer to this potency or to that,—these have all been used. Moreover, when we come to compare the particular therapeutic agencies which are mental rather than physical, we find it difficult to distinguish the cures wrought at Shin-to shrines from those wrought of old in the temples of Aesculapius, or those wrought by Dr. Dowie from those witnessed at Loretto or Lourdes. There is somewhere, if we could only lay our finger upon it, a least common denominator present in every group.

How are we to differentiate the cures obtained under one religious system from those wrought under the auspices of another? Is it after all indifferent whose aid is besought so long as the cure comes? Or, is the cure in every case due to auto-suggestion and independent of external assistance? Such questions will inevitably occur if healing services are to form any considerable part of our parochial machinery, and there is bound to be increasing competition as to method, in which the main standard will be one of material success.

But what is the exact truth as to the use of healing in the earthly ministry of Our Lord? Christ undoubtedly cured large numbers of people who came to Him with the faith that He could work these miracles, but I find no clear evidence that He ever invited these to come by way of anticipating their request. He seems to have even deprecated the

flocking to Him of those who were concerned with the infirmities of the body, but were oblivious of the disease of sin in the soul. He cried: "Come unto Me, ye that are weary and heavy laden!" He does not appear to have said: "Come, all ye that are sick!" He certainly avoided all healings in the crowd, whenever possible, though it has remained for a clerical correspondent in one of our Church papers to suggest that Mr. Hickson would have done better had he employed modern methods of publicity. Does not Christ seem to contrast favorably the spiritual eagerness of the Woman of Samaria with the subsequent attitude of the Galileans, when He said: "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe!" (See S. John iv). Dr. Hall (*The Incarnation*, p. 345) is writing with his usual care when he says: "It is erroneous to regard these (works of healing) as due merely to the promptings of compassion at the sight of bodily suffering; and we may not suppose that God becomes more merciful by taking our nature. . . They were spiritual signs of His saving mission and are to be interpreted in relation to it."

The Divine Love indeed reached to the removal of physical infirmity as one part of the Messianic witness, but it was always in order that by these "signs" He might penetrate to the deeper needs of the spirit. The healing was indeed the parable of the Mission, but not the Mission itself. The kingdom was entered for the first time, not by those whose sickness was healed but by him whom Christ declined to take down from the companion Cross.

As in the ministry of Christ, so in the extension of that ministry in apostolic times. The procedure of the apostles was the procedure of Our Lord prior to the Ascension, save that there was no longer the same need to witness by mira-

cle to the Messianic claims. That was effected once for all by the Resurrection. So, in gradually declining degree, the apostles used the faith of the multitudes who beset them to provide access to their spiritual sensibility but in no case did they further encourage the resort to them of those who came with the specific object of bodily relief.

In the meantime Christianity was already beginning to produce its normal fruit of physical amelioration through the proclamation of man's spiritual nature. To a world lifted above the material by the appeal to man as the child of eternity there flowed, out of this discovered world of spirit, influences which gave freedom to the slave even when his body remained in fetters, wealth to the poor even when their poverty was unrelieved, health to the sick even when their sickness was unremoved. In this respect Robert Norwood is not far from the truth in his "Man of Kerioth," when he makes Bartimaeus exclaim:

"He made me independent of two eyes

And taught me how to see life through the soul."

and says of the lame man:

"He walks with greater joy on summer roads

Than they who travel on their sandal'd feet."

From another point of view we may say that all the subsequent developments of a Christian philanthropy, in the extension of hospitals, the training of nurses, the provision of institutions for the poor, and the development of medical missions in foreign lands, are the proper and legitimate projection of the healing mission of Christ into the ages.

Now just because we detect in the popularity of present-day healing cults, even within the Church, a certain subtle substitution of values, it is to be expected that, apart from the principle itself, many dangers of a diverse character

would not be far away from the movement. Let me briefly summarize the more obvious of these.

1. There is the danger of forming wrong conceptions as to the meaning of Christian prayer. The prayer-word may be a power-word even apart from Christian sanctions. All too terribly potent are some of those life prayers which end by God giving men their desire and sending there withal leanness into their souls. Not infrequently do we have illustrated that terrible picture by Burne-Jonea, "*The Depths of the Sea*," in which the young man is dragged down to the green waters of the sea-monster's cave, while the motto affirms: "Habes tota quod mente petisti, Infelix!" But Christian prayer is not a kind of machinery for obtaining just what in our ignorance we want. God always answers prayer, but for those who pray as Christians the answer is conditioned by ready submission to the divine will. Nor may Mr. Hickson, whatever be his exegesis of particular passages, assume that God's will is always to be found in the avoidance rather than in the acceptance of suffering. It is fairly certain that S. Paul found his physical disabilities irremovable by faithful prayer and learned instead to find a special grace in the accepted weakness. God's will is to be recognized in the operation of all the laws of nature and who shall say that those who have been unable to rid themselves of the disease may not be able to rise victoriously above the disability? Dr. Leighton Parks once wrote: "Some one ought to write a book on the Strength of the Weaklings. What a noble company of confessors it has been! Paul and the lame slave Epictetus in the days of old; the fever-shaken Wolfe climbing the heights of Abraham; Grant holding back death with one hand, while with the other he wrote the story of the great war; Stevenson writ-

ing from his bed the tales of adventure that make our blood pulse quicker while his own blood ebbed away!"

2. Following closely on this is the danger of taking a view of sickness which regards it as a judgment on the individual from God or else as a sign of inefficacy in prayer. This is only one degree removed from the superciliousness with which Job's friends viewed the case of the patriarch, or the judgment passed by the Jews upon the victims of the Tower of Siloam. The late General Convention seems to have been "rushed" into the belief that our Prayer Book petitions for the sick are all wrong and that it is faithless to assume that possibly the patient may not recover. My one gleam of sympathy with the late Dr. McKim's strictures on the Prayer Book revision is in connection with the sentence: "The revisers have taken pains to discredit the idea that God or providence has anything to do with sickness or affliction." In a book by the Rev. H. B. Wilson, "*The Revival of the Gift of Healing*" (p. 26) the author pronounces the prayer for the sick person in the Prayer Book to be "stifled by the concluding sentence: "Or else give him grace so to take Thy visitation that, after this painful life ended, he may dwell with Thee in life everlasting." He implies that it is a kind of hedging in order to be "on the safe side." Would he prefer insistence that the sick person can in no wise die, or that if he die it is because the prayer was not fervent enough? Further on he remarks that in the prayer for "A person under affliction" it is incredible to many how thinking ministers can say of God, "In Thy wisdom Thou hast seen fit to visit him with trouble and to bring distress upon him." If these are indeed "unfortunate and dismal doctrines," they are certainly in line with facts as the world of history and nature reveals them, unless faithful prayer

is also supposed to avert all the distresses implied by bereavement, plague, pestilence, famine, earthquake and the like.

3. Still further, on the more positive side, there is the danger of failing to perceive the very great blessing that sickness may sometimes bring. No parish priest is without experience of the blessed transformation sometimes wrought in this way.

“Laid aside by illness: thus they say on earth.

Set apart for stillness: thus they say in heaven.”

An old Japanese list of “detestable things” puts in the forefront “people who are never ill,” and strong people certainly need the discipline of sickness at times more than aught else. Assuredly sickness is for our good when we use it as sent by God (1) to teach us something we were slow to learn about; (2) to enable us to enter sympathetically into the lives of other people; (3) to stimulate us to the overcoming of diseases where the remedy is possible, to overcome the disability of the disease where the remedy is delayed, or to use the disability for the glory of God and the good of man where the remedy seems altogether to fail.

4. There is once again the danger of misunderstanding the proper treatment of disease according to the enlightened Christian intelligence of today. How often has not one seen an obstinate insistence that certain physical troubles shall yield to prayer or suggestive treatment of one kind or another when common sense tells us that the remedy is in a surgical operation! It is as sensible to pray for bread without laboring to earn it, or to pray for the removal of a splinter without pulling it out, as to pray for the dissolution of a diseased appendix or a growing tumour without

using the skill of the surgeon for their removal. One would not need to put such a case were it not that Mr. Hickson seems to expect prayer in many cases to take the place of common intelligence, and were it not for the fact that far too many have already died through the postponement of a needed operation because they had been assured they could resolve the trouble by prayer unaided by the labor which must always go to the fulfilling of prayer. In the light of the splendid achievements of Christian philanthropy in the world's hospitals and their constant and close association with prayer, it is absurd to suggest that the Church has in the past forgotten or neglected her mission of healing.

5. Lastly, there is the temptation, which is apt to grow more and more serious with success, of half-cocked clergy, with no special qualification, exploiting the movement, under the influence of hysterical and impressionable people, for illegitimate and selfish purposes. Already the free-will gifts, made in the first flush of anticipatory gratitude, have proved something of a scandal. As time goes on there will be serious risk of misusing gifts of healing, whether genuine or pretended, and whatever evils have resulted in the past from an unregulated use of the confessional by untrained priests are likely to be multiplied and intensified.

But it is necessary to come to some conclusions. I fancy these may be summarized much as follows:

1. There must be much more careful preparation of the general public for any healing mission than has yet been deemed possible. This preparation must discourage the materialistic associations of the cult, must show the sacrilege of using the sacraments of the Church as a mere piece of *materia medica*, must teach a doctrine of prayer free from the suspicion of magic and which does not (as Mr.

Hickson appears to do) misuse such parables as that of the Importunate Widow, and must recognize that the eternal purpose of God is not inconsistent with every form of temporal discipline.

2. There must be much more careful study of the cases treated than has yet been attempted. There must be something more than the loose reports as to the cripples who returned to their seats without their crutches or the blind who affirmed their ability to see. The cases must be studied in their whole history and sequel, in action and in re-action, just as a physician studies his cases and refuses to anticipate.

3. There must be much more devotion on the part of the clergy to the spiritual opportunities afforded in the use of Confession and of Holy Unction. In the former, without arousing unwarranted expectations, the priest may do all that is legitimately effected by a healing mission free from those sensational and spectacular accompaniments which have given the whole matter a false emphasis. In the use of Unction he may both sanctify sacramentally every means used for the healing of the body and also prepare the resigned soul for the inevitable moment of death.

4. Fourthly, there must be much more careful regulation of healing services and practices by the Bishops than has hitherto been asked for or vouchsafed. In the present crisis, while approving editorials in secular newspapers were ready with the declaration that at last the Church was getting down to something practical, there were few of our Bishops who were ready to speak clearly and authoritatively. Some gave their approval, apparently without balanced consideration and study; some dealt with the subject quite perfunctorily; some disapproved privately but

were too timid or indifferent to voice their disapproval; many possibly were not even consulted on the matter.

The subject certainly admits of the most careful and thorough consideration from every point of view. This consideration must be followed up by such a pastoral as shall inform the ignorant, reassure the doubtful, correct the oversanguine, and regulate generally the practice of clergy who might be disposed to respond to the popular demand by plunging recklessly into any convenient current.

5. Lastly, while we acknowledge our constant duty, by every sane means within our power, to diminish the world's burden of pain and grief, we must never allow the Christian world to forget that God's will *does* allow now, as it has allowed from the beginning, the leaven of pain to work in the lump of life. When love has become eternal, when the Cross has become character, then the pain is gone. Then we may drink of the waters of Lethe and say with the martyr of the Catacombs:

"I was some time in being burn'd,
But at the close a Hand came through
The fire above my head, and drew
My soul to Christ, Whom now I see.
Sergius, a brother, writes for me
This testimony on the wall—
For me, I have forgot it all."

Till then the lesson of life is in the discipline of life:

"The cry of man's anguish went up unto God:
'Lord, take away pain,
The shadow that darkens the world Thou hast made,
The close-coiling chain
That strangles the heart, the burden that weighs
On the wings that would soar,—

Lord, take away pain from the world Thou hast made,
That it love Thee the more.'

"Then answered the Lord to the cry of His world:

'Shall I take away pain,
And with it the power of the soul to endure,
Made strong by the strain?
Shall I take away pity that knits heart to heart,
And sacrifice high?
Will ye lose all your heroes that lift from the fire
White brows to the sky?
Shall I take away love that redeems at a price
And smiles at its loss?
Can ye spare from your lives that would climb unto Mine,
The Christ on His Cross?' "

Our Lesser Ladies of November

MINNA CAROLINE SMITH

SAINTE Cecilia surprised me when I compared a number of authorities about her. At first I supposed that it was just the leaning-back tendency of Baring Gould that made him say that she is a legend rather than a reality. Of course none of us really supposed that the long-current pictures of her playing on an organ, or else hovering over one while another person played, were veritable portraits; but to be told that she never did live on this earth below is a bit startling. We are so well accustomed to Saint Cecilia, thanks to Gounod and others, that even the most protesting Protestants born have been willing to depend upon her aid in regard to music.

Yes, Roman authorities too say that her legend began with a fiction story, written to impress upon married Chris-

tians in the third century the various truths in regard to their state and condition which the apostles, especially Saint Paul, had taught. But at St. Jeanne d'Arc Home for Girls in New York, the Superior, horrified at my saying that Saint Cecilia apparently never breathed on earth below, one day lent me a book by Monseigneur Guerin which corrects what is there called the mistake of writers of the nineteenth century, and declares that the "Acts of Saint Cecilia" prove the authenticity of her life "so temerarily contested." The famous French writer tells her story thus:

Saint Cecilia was of an illustrious Roman family, and coming to taste of the love of Jesus Christ at a very early age, she opened her hart to him completely. Her parents, not knowing that she had become Christian, married her to a young noble Valerien. She told her husband on her wedding night that she might not be wife to him, as she was pledged to a heavenly bridegroom (Like Saint Etheldreda in the history of the early English church centuries later). Valerien was converted to Christianity, and through Cecilia's efforts, when they conveyed her to prison, the soldiers of the Roman prefect were also converted, and were baptized. Four hundred of Cecilia's converts, men and women, were baptized. The story goes on in the French that the prefect "having learned what had happened, was extremely irritated, and sent at once to summon Cecilia before his tribunal." Having tempted her by offering everything possible that a girl of her age and birth might wish for, he ordered her shut up in a hot steam bath for twenty-four hours, but as she took no ill from this, he ordered the headsman to cut off her head in the bath. He tried three times in vain. The faithful preserved the cloths soaked in her lifeblood, for after lingering three days she

died from the murderous assault. About four hundred years later her cult began, her relics were placed with those of Saint Urbain and Saint Valerien in a church named for Saint Cecilia. After another seven hundred years Gregory XIV made a grand fête for her, and since that time the patron of music, who eased her suffering in prison by constant playing on "an instrument of music" has been believed a reality. At all events Saint Cecilia certainly lives in the soul of music for many thousands who have not been interested in others of the women who have indubitably lived and died for the faith. Saint Cecilia's Day is November 22.

Three days later is the festival of one of the greatest saints of the calendar, beloved in the Eastern Church before the division, and no less beloved in the Western Church from Rome to Chicago, from Paris to San Francisco, Saint Catherine of Alexandria. Her day is November 26. Monseigneur Guerin's chapter about her is so interesting that I am giving it all in a direct translation:

"This illustrious virgin and martyr Catherine, who is so celebrated among the Greeks under the name of *Æcatherine*, was born at Alexandria in Egypt of a brilliant and noble family, called royal by Simeon Metaphraste. It is told that after her baptism, which she was urged in vision to receive, Jesus Christ appeared to her, and gave her a thousand witnesses of His watchfulness and affection, even to taking her for His '*spouse*' in presence of His very holy Mother, and of a great multitude of celestial spirits. He put upon her finger a miraculous ring, which indeed she found after her waking from vision, and which made her know the truth of this divine alliance. This is why the painters ordinarily represent her near the adorable Jesus, receiving a ring from His hand.

“Having a keen, vital mind, ready for all things, she applied herself in her youth to the study of philosophy and of theology; in these she succeeded so admirably, that, in spite of the feebleness of her sex, she became capable of sustaining the verities of our religion against the most subtle sophists. In these times—about the year 307 A. D.—Maximin II, nephew of the son-in-law of Diocletian, ruling under Constantine the Great over this district of Egypt, made his residence in Alexandria, capital of this province. This cruel and barbarous prince published an edict ordering all his subjects to make sacrifices to the gods, condemning to great sufferings and to death those who failed in obedience. He desired to make a shining example of this impiety, and himself to make the most famous offering to the gods that had been seen for a very long time in Alexandria!

“Our Saint—Catherine—did not content herself with urging all Christians to flee from this impious solemnity; she resolved to face the emperor herself in the middle of the temple of Serapis, where he was conducting the infamous ceremony with all his court, and remonstrate with him for his impiety. She dared indeed to go and tell him publicly that if he would consult the simple light of reason, or even the philosophers like Diodorus of Sicily or Plutarch, he would recognize that there is but one God.

“The emperor, interrupted, replied to her that he had not now the time to listen to her, but would do so when more at leisure. He sent for her as soon as he went back to his palace; and, embarrassed a second time by her science, her wisdom and her eloquence, he told her that not being himself versed in this sort of thing, he would not undertake to reply to her objections, but he would, if she wished, assem-

ble the philosophers of the empire to discuss this with the young princess.

"Catherine accepted, counting on divine aid. So fifty of the most able sophists were convened. And, on the day and at the hour fixed, the emperor having taken his place on the throne, the discussion opened between this young girl of fifteen years and this army of philosophers gathered from the schools. Their chief began by severely reprimanding Catherine for opposing herself to the most clear authority of poets, orators and philosophers, who had all unanimously revered Jupiter, Neptune, Minerva and the other divinities. He quoted passages from them, concluding that their religion, being supported by such witnesses, ought to prevail over Christianity which was totally unknown in antiquity.

"Catherine listened patiently to his discourse, holding herself certain of victory, for an angel had come to reassure her for the side of God. When her opponent had finished, first having won the esteem and the love of her auditors by an exordium filled with eloquence and *esprit*, she undertook to show forth three things: First that the history of the gods, of which the sophist had spoken, was but pure fable that no man of mind could approve; second, that in good philosophy one should recognize but one sole God, creator and governor of all the world; third, that one must without prejudice to the unity of God, recognize Jesus Christ, true God and true man, who had come to redeem the world.

"She showed the first point by exposing the ridiculous stories that Homer, Orpheus and the other poets had made of their own divinities, the abominable crimes they attributed to them, their origin not going back more than a few centuries, and the assertion of certain ones among these

that the gods did not exist except in the notions of the vulgar. She showed her second point by citations drawn from the books of Plato and Aristotle, and proved therefrom that it was possible to have but one sole governor of the universe, one sole principle of all motion, and one sole Infinite Being, independent and essential. At last, she proved her third point by the accomplishment of the prophecies of the Old Testament, and above all by the testimony of the Sibyls, to whom the pagans deferred exceedingly, and who had announced very clearly the time and circumstances of the coming of the Messiah.

“A discourse so powerful and so energetic filled all the assembly with admiration and astonishment. The chief of the philosophers who had opened the discussion was so much touched that when Catherine asked him if he had anything to reply, avowed that he was vanquished, and that he would willingly give himself to the truths that the Holy Spirit had announced to him from her mouth. Maximin, in a transport of wrath, ordered the others to take up the dispute, and to refute all that Catherine had said. But grace had also operated in their hearts, and they had entirely subscribed to all that this celestial teacher had said. They answered therefore that as their chief had given himself to the doctrine of Catherine, they had nothing to say against it; that they too found it very reasonable, and it was only from ignorance that they had opposed her before.

“They also declared to the young virgin that no consideration nor violence should make them renounce this doctrine; and thanking her for her graciousness in causing them to pass from darkness into light, from error to truth, and from death unto life, they begged her to succor them with her prayers. Maximin, more furious than ever, had

them all arrested by his soldiers and cast into the flames, where they were martyred in their baptism of fire.

"The emperor, ferocious as he was, could not help being much taken with the high qualities of Catherine and with her beauty. He conceived a violent love for her, and although married, offered her his hand and his throne. Catherine mocked at his proposal and promises. She told him she was equally attached to Christianity and to chastity which she had vowed, and that she would never have any other God or spouse than Jesus Christ. This refusal so much irritated Maximin that he commanded that the young virgin should be put to torture on the rack, that her body should be torn till her sufferings would make her understand what it was to despise the kindness of so great a prince as himself. This sentence was carried out during two hours of such cruelty as he wished. After this he ordered that the saint should be cast into a ditch, without having her wounds dressed nor her blood staunched, and there left to die of hunger.

"After these cruel orders he left the town. Now his wife Faustine, being warned in a dream, went with Porphyry, first captain of the guard, to find Catherine, who was all glowing with health, having been healed and nursed by her celestial Bridegroom. The empress and the captain were both converted, and learned from the mouth of the saint that in three days they should all three have courage to suffer martyrdom for Jesus Christ.

"Maximin returned; and, amazed to find his victim healthier and more beautiful than ever, and more inflexible towards himself, ordered by counsel of the prefect Cursade, that a machine should be made of three or four great wheels, pointed with sharp iron and razors, to the end that

Catherine's body, being fastened there, should be torn to pieces by the artificial movement of the wheels. While they were working industriously making this machine Catherine was again imprisoned. At the end of three days Maximin had her brought before him; and unable to overcome the invincible firmness of her heart, had her fastened to the wheel.

"This terrible instrument terrified everybody; but at its first whirling it was miraculously broken to pieces, so that the young girl received from it no wound at all. The sharp points of the wheel flew off on all sides and wounded and killed several bystanders. The other spectators, recognizing the hand of the All Powerful, cried out that the God of the Christians was great.

"This made strange trouble for the emperor. However he did not diminish his barbarities. On the contrary, his wife having come to him to urge that he should see that all these miracles demonstrated the truth of the Christian religion, he had her head at once chopped off; and he did the same by the Captain Porphyry, who voluntarily offered himself for death with two hundred soldiers, to whom after his own conversion he had been apostle and evangelist. Faustine was put to death on November 23, and Porphyry November 24. These executions gave the emperor opportunity to solicit Catherine to be so good as to marry him, since it seemed to him that the principal obstacle to such marriage had been removed. He made a fine speech to her, which the saint heard with horror. She took a severe tone of great disgust, and replying to a fool according to his folly, she told him that he was unworthy to enjoy the breath of life, since after witnessing so many miracles of the power of God he refused still to adore Him, and wished to snatch from Him a maid consecrated to Him. The fury

of Maximin was once more aroused and he ordered that Catherine be at once taken to the market place and decapitated.

"On the way she asked two things of our Lord; first that He permit none of her butchers to touch her virgin body after her death; second, that He would finish the persecutions against the Church, and banish from earth the shadows of idolatry, that His Light might shine forth. She was assured by a Voice that her requests should be taken up to heaven. At last, she bowed her head to the executioner, and her head was taken off on the 26th of November, 307, when she was about nineteen years of age.

"Her body was transported by angels to Mount Sinai, where this princess had once taken refuge during the years of her persecution by Maximin. Since that time the religious at Sinai have heard from time to time wonderful melodies of the celestial host.

"Saint Catherine is represented with a crown on her head, a sword in hand, a ring on her hand, a broken wheel at her side, the head of an emperor under her feet; sometimes she is shown receiving the ring of her heavenly vows.

"Her memory is greatly cherished in Greece and the East; and in the West for the succor that princes and nobles of Europe have received from her strong protection in working for the deliverance of the Holy Land."

So ends Monsigneur Guerin's story of this saint. Is it not true that as we of the Church in America become more and more ready to study lives of saints—especially of women among them—that we feel a keener interest in what they are doing now, and what they have been doing in the life they have entered. Does not their communion become more real to us, when we ask any of them to pray for us?

BOOK REVIEWS

Biblical and Oriental Series. The Rev. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph.D., Editor.

1. The Book of Genesis, for Bible Classes and Private Study.
2. The Growth of Religious and Moral Ideas in Egypt.
3. Religious and Moral Ideas in Babylonia and Assyria.

(All three are published by the Morehouse Publishing Co.)

In the first volume of this series Dr. Mercer has employed a startlingly unique method. He attempts a synthesis of the conclusions of the best of higher critical scholarship with the dominant and persisting religious ideas which have matured in Catholic Christianity. Genesis is studied in detail, yet in such a way as to be vital, interesting and practical. For example, after reading the account of the Fall in the text, the student is directed to compare with it Kyle's commentary *ad loc.*, read St. James 1, 14-15. Reference to the article in Hastings Bible Dictionary, s. v. "Fall," prepares him to study Mercer's text (p. 45). The suggested paper on the topic faces squarely the problem of temptation. (p. 46.) This indicates the method of the book. The lessons are graded for three classes of people: those who can invest only a small amount of time in study; those who can put more; and students who have the opportunity and interest fairly completely to engage upon the problems arising in the course of Bible study. Each chapter is summarized under a single topic, or subdivided. So "Bible reading" is given perspective and objective, instead of being allowed to degenerate into a casual and undirected browsing about in an alien country. The comments are clear and succinct: "Those records which give a peculiarly spiritual, truly religious, and a satisfactorily moral idea of the character of God... we call inspired." (p. 4.) "The unit of ancient life was the family, and here (Gen. 3, 20-21) we have sin beginning only after the establishment of a family. Sin then has a social aspect..." (p. 50). Perhaps a still more striking feature of the text is the illustration and development of the ideas of Genesis by reference to other books of the Holy Scriptures, of both testaments. Under the topic "Abraham's plea" (Gen. 18, 22-23) the relation of the divine attributes of "mercy and justice" is suggested, and reference made to Exodus 32, and Amos 7. In the following topic ("the Righteous and Wicked") the student is directed to the problem of the Book of Job (p. 105-8).

The only criticism that suggests itself to me in considering the aim and method of the work, is that few of those who would most profit by it may be induced to invest the necessary time and effort to use this text. I am

certain that its originality, freshness, and lucidity will commend it to many, however, who have the good will to desire to learn, and the discernment to recognize that all true knowledge cannot be administered from without. The student can make or mar his own progress in learning. Dr. Mercer's book is constructed on the principle that a student must be guided and directed, but not crammed, for all true knowledge must be made one's own and not simply accepted passively.

In the next two volumes, on Religious Ideas in Egypt and Babylonia and Assyria, Dr. Mercer follows a different scheme, presenting the ideas under the five following topics: God, Man, Mediation, Future Life and Morality. The introduction in each case follows a chronological table, and thus, the reader is orientated in what would otherwise be a rather confusing jumble of data. For example, the double strand in Egyptian theology,—of Rā and Osiris,—is discernible throughout the religious history of a people too prone to conserve all religious ideas whatever, without discrimination. It is no small feat to have made such an uninviting mess of data, such as we have in the Egyptian field, yield intense interest, and to do this without artificiality and forcing the evidence.

Babylonia and Assyria have always been more congenial subjects. It has been said that if Assyria had been left to her own development she might have evolved a true monotheism. The great defect in the Assyrian development was the too scanty interest in the future life (cf. pp. 90-95, 122) as perhaps the great emphasis on it was the contribution of the Religion of Egypt.

Of course it is difficult to compress researches in so vast a storehouse of religious remains into so small a volume, but it is emphatically true that such a condensation is the test of familiarity with the facts. Any great work can be susceptible of reduction into small compass, so I would plead with those who would have a clear, concise, and yet fairly complete knowledge of these religious literatures, not to be put off by the small size of little books written about great subjects. Let us have more of them!

FRANK GAVIN, S. S. J. E.

Tertulian Against Praxeas. By A. Soutet, D.Litt., Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1919.

Dr. Soutet has added a valuable volume to the Series of Translations of Christian Literature. The tract of Tertulian "Against Praxeas" is the earliest extant treatise on the Trinity. Despite his Montanism, this great writer yet did much to defend the great, primal truths of the Church's

faith. He ranks as one of the leading teachers of the Church. Like Origen, who also fell into error, he fell short of fully understanding the Church's position, and is, therefore, not reckoned among the Fathers. His Latin was unclassical and barbarous to an extent that makes it most difficult reading. This clear-cut and smooth translation must be considered as a triumph of knowledge and skill. The little volume will prove invaluable also as a guide to all who wish to read this important work in the original. And it will give to those who lack the ability or the time to dig their way through the obscurities of the great African's diction, the opportunity to study the early controversies between Monarchism or Modalism, the precursor of Sabellianism, Arianism, and other later forms of Unitarianism, and the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Nor is this discussion of merely historical interest, for these same heretical views are constantly reappearing in our own day, as they have recurred in the past, in practically the same form, backed by practically the same arguments. It is well to have such a treasure house of orthodox arguments as this tractate wherewith to meet them.

F. C. H. W.

A Short History of the Doctrine of the Atonement. By L. W. Grensted. Manchester University Press and Longmans, Green & Co. 1920. pp. x+376.

The author is Principal of Edgerton Hall and Lecturer in the History of Doctrine in the University of Manchester. He presents a careful and readable summary of the development of Christian thought regarding the Atonement, beginning with the Bible witness, coming down through the fathers, east and west; St. Anselm and the mediæval theologians; Roman and Anglican writers of modern days, and the developments in protestant bodies resulting from the reformation. He points out that while in the case of the doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation we have careful definitions, in the case of the Atonement, the Church, convinced of the great reality of the fact, "has never found it necessary or desirable to set her seal to any special theory for the explanation of that fact." While protestant thought swings back and forth, from the revolting extreme of Calvin to the baldest form of the "moral theory," orthodox catholic theologians such as Bishop Forbes and H. N. Oxenham tend to gather up the best from the great fathers and theologians and bring together both the objective and the mystical aspects of the Cross.

The author quotes his sources very fully, using the English in the text, but supplying the original in the foot notes.

H. K. P.

New Books—Just Received

**The New Book by the
BISHOP OF LONDON**

VICTORY AND AFTER

A series of sermons: 3 classified "In Deep Water," 3 "Advent Sermons," 4 "Tributes to the Fallen," 8 "Lenten Sermons," 1 "Easter Sermon, 1919." Cloth. \$1.35. Postage about 10 cts.

This, the cheery volume containing sermons delivered by the Bishop of London since victory crowned the efforts of the Allies, has long been waited for. During the darkest days of the War the Bishop confidently predicted victory because the cause for which the Allies were contending was the cause of God. It was he, to a large extent, who kept England confident. Now, his faith having triumphed, he is preaching to his people the duties that rest upon them since the War.

The Bishop of London is the greatest "popular preacher" of the Anglican Communion. His new volume will be eagerly received.

A New "Handbook of Catholic Faith and Practice"

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

By DARWELL STONE, D.D., Principal of Pusey House, Oxford. Cloth, \$1.50. Postage about 10 cts.

This is a thoroughly scholarly, yet readable, treatise upon a subject too seldom understood by Churchmen. It consists, first, of six sermons, preached to congregations in London and in Oxford, the publication of which was requested by those who heard them; and of a series of appended notes, more especially for scholars, treating more fully of matters growing out of the sermons, or citing the author's authority for statements. The book is less technical and more popular in its treatment than some of Dr. Stone's larger volumes and should be widely read.

"No one could read these pages without feeling that Anglo Catholicism stands for much more than sentiment or pietism. Both in regard to its price and size, this is just the book to recommend to any fairly educated reader who wants clear teaching on the subject . . . Not a word wasted."—*London Church Times*.

AMERICAN PUBLISHERS:

Morehouse Publishing Co.

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Ave.

Milwaukee, Wis.